

**Forty-Eighth**  
**Anniversary Conference**

*NASPA*

**(The Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs  
founded in 1919.)**

**OLYMPIC HOTEL**  
**Seattle, Washington**

**JUNE 26-28, 1966**



# P R O C E E D I N G S

## FORTY - EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

### NASPA

(The Association of Deans and Administrators  
of Student Affairs founded in 1919.)

---

### Officers of the Association 1965 - 66

President .....Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students,  
Hunter College (Bronx)  
President Designate .....Edmund G. Williamson, Dean of  
Students, University of  
Minnesota  
Secretary-Treasurer .....Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men,  
University of Illinois  
Conference Chairman .....Thomas A. Emmet, Dean of McNichols  
Evening Division, College of  
Arts and Sciences,  
University of Detroit  
Editor .....Richard Siggelkow, Dean of  
Students, State  
University of New York

### Regional Vice Presidents

Region I William L. Swartzbaugh, Associate Dean of the  
College, Amherst College  
Region II Joseph Cole, Dean of Student Affairs,  
University of Rochester  
Region III David W. Robinson, Dean of Student Affairs,  
Emory University  
Region IV Chester E. Peters, Dean of Students,  
Kansas State University  
Region V Robert Shaffer, Dean of Students,  
Indiana University  
Region VI Donald M. DuShane, Dean of Students,  
University of Oregon  
Region VII A. T. Brugger, Dean of Students, University  
of California (Riverside)

NOTE: The material in this book is a transcribed account  
of the proceedings of the annual meeting. The  
contents are reproduced as they were transcribed  
without the benefit of editing or rewriting.

## DIRECTORS AND OTHER MAJOR OFFICERS

### Professional Relations and Legislation

Chester E. Peters, Dean of Students, Kansas  
State University, Manhattan

### Professional Development and Standards

Robert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami  
University, Oxford, Ohio

### Research and Publications

Peter H. Armacost, Program Director, Association  
of American Colleges,  
Washington, D. C.

### Association Personnel and Services

Earle W. Clifford, Dean of Student Affairs,  
Rutgers University,  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

### Placement Officer

Richard E. Hulet, Dean of Students, Illinois  
State University, Normal

### Historian

Fred H. Turner, Dean of Students, University  
of Illinois, Champaign

### Pre-Conference Chairman

Dean C. William Brown, Assistant Dean of Men,  
Purdue University, Lafayette

### Executive Committee

#### Members at Large

Carl Anderson, Associate Dean of Students,  
Howard University,  
Washington, D. C.

Willard W. Blaesser, Dean of Students, City  
College of New York

William A. Perkins, S. J., Vice President for  
Student Affairs, University  
of Santa Clara, Santa Clara

O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men, Purdue University,  
Lafayette, Indiana

## FUTURE CONFERENCE SITES AND TENTATIVE DATES

- 1967 Cincinnati, Ohio - Netherland Hilton Hotel,  
April 10-12 (49)  
1968 Minneapolis, Minnesota - Leamington Hotel, March 31-  
April 2 (50th) Golden Conference  
1969 Atlanta, Georgia - Marriot Motor Hotel and Regency  
Hotel, April 11-14 (51) (Joint conference with NAWDC)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
Officers .....	1
Future Conference Sites and Dates .....	11
<b>ORIENTATION MEETING</b>	
Sunday - June 26, 1966	
Welcome -	
Chairman Earle W. Clifford .....	1
Orientation for all First Time	
Attendees to NASPA - Resource	
Panel Members -	
Dean Donald DuShane.....	1
Dean Glen Nygreen .....	4
Dean E. G. Williamson .....	8
Discussion and Question Period .	12
<b>FIRST GENERAL SESSION - OPENING DINNER</b>	
Sunday - June 26, 1966	
Chairman - President Nygreen .....	20
Invocation -	
Dean J. Elliott Cameron .....	20
Introductions - President Nygreen .	20
Greetings -	
Very Rev. John Fitterer, S.J. ..	27
Address -	
Dr. Glenn Leggett .....	29
Conference Announcements .....	39
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION A</b>	
Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966	
"Current Federal Programs of Direct	
Involvement to Student Personnel	
Administrators"	
Chairman William Knapp .....	41
Resource Persons -	
Dr. James Moore .....	44
Dr. Robert Goodridge .....	49
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION B</b>	
Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966	
"Considerations Concerning Profes-	
sional Preparation of Student	
Personnel Administrators"	
Chairman Robert Etheridge .....	68



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Page

### GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION B (Continued)

Resource Persons -	
Dean James Rhatigan .....	72
Dr. Jane Matson .....	78
Dean Stanley Benz .....	88
Dean John Truitt	
Dean Jack Sorrells	

### GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION C

Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966

"The American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges Statements on Student Freedoms -- A Comparison and Discussion of Viewpoints"

Chairman Patrick H. Ratterman ....	92
Resource Person -	
Dr. Peter Armacost .....	94

### GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION D

Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966

"A Systems Approach to Constructing Student Housing"

Chairman Clayton Kantz .....	108
Resource Person -	
Mr. Ezra Ehrenkrantz .....	115

### SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Monday - June 27, 1966

Chairman -	
President-Elect Williamson ....	124
Presidential Address -	
Dean Glen T. Nygreen .....	124
Reactors -	
Dr. Phillip Tripp .....	138
Dean Miriam A. Shelden .....	141
Dean Robert Shaffer .....	144

### THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Monday - June 27, 1966

Chairman Arthur E. McCartan .....	150
Address -	
Rev. Andrew Greeley .....	151
Discussion .....	164

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

## LUNCHEON

Monday - June 27, 1966

Liberal Arts College  
Representatives

Chairman - Dean William Swift ....	168
Invocation - Dean Robert Porter ..	168
Introductions - Chairman Swift ...	168
Address -	
Dr. John R. Howard .....	170

## INFORMATION SESSION

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"The Role of the Student Personnel  
Administrator in Institutional  
Research"

Chairman - Dean Thomas Hansmeier .	181
Resource Persons -	
Dr. James Sours .....	184
Dr. K. Patricia Cross .....	189
Discussion .....	198

## SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

✓ "The Student Personnel Administrator  
and Student Involvement in  
Community Affairs"

Chairman - Dean James E. Quigley .	201
Resource Person -	
Professor Howard Higman .....	202
Discussion .....	217

## SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"Drugs on the College Campus"

Chairman - Richard E. Covert .....	218
Resource Persons -	
Dr. Akira Horita .....	219
Dr. Henry B. Bruyn .....	226
Dr. Carl L. Anderson .....	231
Discussion .....	233

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## P a g e

### INFORMATION SESSION

Monday - June 27, 1966

"The Junior College Student Personnel Services and Staff Inventory - Conclusions -- Results"	
Chairman - Dr. Frederick T. Giles	237
Resource Persons -	
Dr. Max Raines .....	237
Dr. Jane Matson .....	247
Discussion .....	257

### DISCUSSION GROUP SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon, June 27, 1966

"The Environmental Dimensions of Campus Planning and the Role of the Student Personnel Administrator"	
Chairman - Dean Roland Patzer .....	258
Resource Persons -	
Mr. Daniel Kiley .....	259
Dean Robert L. Geddes .....	264
Reactor -	
Dean William L. Swartzbaugh ....	274

### SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

✓ "The Non Student"	
Chairman - Dean Warner Wick .....	277
Resource Person -	
Mr. William A. Watts .....	277
Discussion .....	286

### SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"The Deans' Assumptions: Some Issues for the Profession"	
Chairman - Dr. Peter Armacost .....	293
Advisory Committee Members -	
Dean Jack W. Graham .....	296
Dean Thomas B. Dutton .....	306
Dr. Phillip A. Tripp .....	312
Discussion .....	316



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
FOURTH GENERAL SESSION	
BUSINESS MEETING	
Tuesday - June 28, 1966	
Chairman - President Nygreen .....	323
Reports -	
Conference Chairman Emmet .....	323
NASPA Journal Editor Siggelkow..	324
Professional Development and	
Standards - Dean Etheridge ..	326
Association Personnel & Services	
Dean Clifford .....	327
Association of American Colleges	
Program Director Armacost ...	334
Professional Relations and	
Legislation - Dean Peters ...	340
Placement Officer - Dean Hulet .	341
Pre-Conference Chairman Brown ..	343
International Student Programs -	
Dean Blaesser	
Secretary-Treasurer - Carl Knox.	347
Association Budget and Central	
Office - Dean Roberts .....	347
Constitutional Changes -	
President Nygreen .....	349
Committee on Nominations -	
Past President Stibbs .....	353
Election of Officers .....	355
FIFTH GENERAL SESSION	
Tuesday - June 28, 1966	
Chairman - Dean Paul Bloland .....	356
Address -	
Dr. Terry Lunsford .....	357
CONFERENCE LUNCHEON SESSION	
Tuesday - June 28, 1966	
Chairman - Dean Donald M. DuShane .	378
Invocation - Rabbi Jacobovitz .....	378
Address -	
Dean Leona Tyler .....	380
SEMINAR	
Tuesday - June 28, 1966	
"The Myth of the Organized University: Alienation and Value Confusion"	
Chairman - Dean Robert Chick .....	393
Resource Person - Dr. B. Spilka ...	393
Discussion .....	404

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## P a g e

### SEMINAR

Tuesday - June 28, 1966

"The Role of Intercollegiate  
Athletics in Higher Education --  
A Reconsideration"

Chairman - Dean Lyle Reynolds.....	405
Resource Persons -	
Dr. Richard Balch .....	409
Admiral Thomas Hamilton .....	414
Mr. Richard Larkins .....	419
Mr. Jeremiah Ford .....	428
Discussion .....	435
Conference Announcements .....	447

### SEMINAR

Tuesday - June 28, 1966

"The Student Personnel Administrator  
as Educator: Alcohol Education"

Chairman - Dean David W. Robinson .	448
Resource Persons -	
Mr. George C. Dimas .....	449
Dr. Henry B. Bruyn .....	459
Discussion .....	466

### SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

#### CONFERENCE DINNER

Tuesday - June 28, 1966

Chairman - Dean Donald K. Anderson.	470
Invocation - Rev. Robert Rebhahn ..	470
Remarks and Introductions -	
Chairman Anderson .....	470
Presentation of NASPA Distinguished Service Awards -	
President Nygreen .....	474
1966 Recipients -	
William H. Cowley .....	478
Esther McDonald Lloyd-Jones	
Address -	
Dr. Paul Woodring .....	480
Passing of the Gavel .....	492
Remarks -	
President Nygreen .....	492
President Williamson .....	493
Adjournment .....	494

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
APPENDIX A	
Report of the Secretary .....	495
Treasurer's Report .....	496
APPENDIX B	
Roster of Members	
Voting Delegates .....	498
Institutional Delegates .....	509
Associates .....	517
Student Affiliates .....	521
APPENDIX C	
Attendance 48th Conference .....	523
APPENDIX D	
Committee on Nominations .....	532
APPENDIX E	
Summary of Previous Meetings .....	533



ORIENTATION MEETING  
Sunday - June 26, 1966

The Meeting and Orientation for All First Time Attenders to NASPA, held in conjunction with the 48th Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, June 26-28, 1966, at the Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, convened at two o'clock, Dean Earle W. Clifford, Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University, and Director NASPA Association, Personnel and Services, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: According to the president's watch, which is about as reliable as the president's prediction of my Doctoral degree -- I had to get even -- it is now five minutes after the scheduled starting time. That is about the only thing we are going to be formal about, despite the setup of the room.

The program says that the purpose of this session, or its intent, is to have a discussion and question period on Association activities. To accomplish that purpose we have three well-informed panel members. They are not going to be introduced, because they have been introduced, and you are not going to be welcomed because you have been welcomed, and they are not going to speak too long because we want to hear any questions you have. They have been told they have five to seven minutes. I have very little possibility of controlling them, at least in terms of past experience, but we will try to shoot for that target.

For purposes of this discussion, Dean Don DuShane is going to be Mr. Yesterday and talk about the Association's past. Our current President, Glen Nygreen, is going to be Mr. Today and talk about what has been going on this year. Our President-Elect, Dr. Williamson, is going to talk about tomorrow and he will be Mr. Tomorrow.

I am not going to introduce them any more than that, and I am not going to interrupt their presentation by further injecting myself in this equation.

I will simply now call on Mr. Yesterday to pick up at this point with NASPA's past. Don DuShane.

DEAN DONALD DUSHANE (Northwest Regional Vice President, NASPA): I am getting about enough of this "retread" at luncheon and "Mr. Yesterday" now.

So I got up here and was waiting eagerly to be at the performing center just like a trained dog, you know, who just cannot wait to go into his act, thus

hoping to prove eternal youth or something.

I am subbing for Fred Turner, who normally handles this particular chore -- though I do not think for Fred it is a chore, and it is not for me either -- to give you in a few minutes a quick resume of some of the feeling and some of the sentiments of the past 48 years of this Association.

This Association was founded by two famous Deans, Tommy Arkle Clark of Illinois, and Scott E. Goodnight of Wisconsin, in 1919, at which time Deans of Men were facing post-war problems which were perplexing to them. They were new at the business. There had not been any long tradition of professional background, or any past patterns of how to solve a post-war readjustment, and these Deans met to share their problems, probably more on the principle that misery loves company than any other one.

They found that no matter how bad things seemed to be on the campuses that they had just left to come to the meetings, others on other campuses were facing situations which were not very encouraging either.

Through the years Deans, sometimes solitary, professional figures in small institutions, even in big ones, supported only by their staffs who felt sometimes beleaguered in their institutions, most of the members of which (student or faculty) did not understand the way things were, or the real impact of problems, have gotten comfort and solace from meeting together with the others from other places who face the same problems.

I remember at the meeting at Boston at the Harvard Graduate School of Business, Fred Weaver, later President of NASPA, told about how he had spent his sabbatical year, touring the country from one campus to another campus to another campus, visiting his friends who were Deans of Students, Deans of Men, and wherever he went there were problems, and every place the problems seemed different, and they seemed worse than in all the places he had been before. That was in a good, typical year.

What was NADAM has now grown to NASPA, from a few dozen members who believed in informality, but what one of our distinguished members liked to call comradery. Their meetings were enlivened by cracks like Scott Goodnights, "The youth of today likes to think of itself as unfettered, when really it is unbuttoned." (Laughter)

There are many reminiscences about meetings, like the one at Gatlinburg -- this was before my day, but the Deans who met in the mountains of the Great Smokies at Gatlinburg, off from the rest of the world, seemed to think that that Gatlinburg meeting was a great experience.

They talked also about the Baton Rouge meeting where they had an audience with Huey Long -- Huey in his pajamas in a hotel room.

They talked about the trip to Dallas in 1948, when something went wrong with the heating in the Pullmans and something went wrong with the Texas weather. It was ten above that morning in Dallas when the train got in, and there was a strong wind blowing right out of the north.

Then they talk about happy occasions like the trips on railroad club cars, and so on.

They talk about the high spots in the programs, like Hal Cowley's address on the subject of the Vanishing Dean of Men.

I remember -- coming to personal reminiscences -- here -- I remember my first meeting at Albuquerque in 1940, right after Wendell Wilke and Senator McCarthy had been nominated for the presidency on the Republican ticket. We met in Albuquerque, and I was a junior Dean, Green Ribbon, if we had it back then, green tag if we had it like now, and I went hesitantly up to the mezzanine of that Hilton Hotel in Albuquerque, one of Hilton's first of the chain that he started at Lubbock, Texas, and met Fred Turner, who was Secretary of the organization, and from that moment until now I have never felt a stranger. I have never felt friendless, and I have never felt lonely in this NADAM-NASPA group.

At that meeting, which was my first, I worked on a committee with Jim Finley, later President of Drury College, 1940 to work out a statement about what the Deans thought about the draft. I had a burning conviction that the college presidents of the country, in their stupidity (laughter), had gone to the military and said, "All right, just tell us what you want to do in this international crisis, and we will do it." And I did not think that was what educational leaders ought to do. I thought we ought to provide some leadership. So did Jim Finley. We sat down and got together and hammered out a proposal which, for the first time, NADAM adopted on a public issue. I was a beginning Dean.

Incidentally, that was the occasion when we



got our first Honorary Member, H. Roe Bartle of Kansas City, who took the microphone and twisted it away from him and said, "I do not need these things. They are like a spittoon; they are no good unless you hit them." He electrified the Deans with the corniest address we ever heard at a NADAM meeting, and we elected him an honorary member.

We have now our only continuing Honorary Member sitting down here, and I am sure you will be introduced to Leo some of these days, sometime in the next day or so.

But the point I want to make is that early NADAM has changed, and it has grown. We have many more members; we have both sexes. I think that is a change for the good.

But almost universally we will find the men and women who have been with NASPA for awhile saying, "We do not want to lose the comradeship and the informality and the friendliness in the Deans of Men and Deans of Students and Deans of Women," because they are persons who are warm and friendly and concerned about students, and they are the people who know students and human nature best.

I think it is a wonderful thing for me in my professional career to have been associated with men and women who have these talents.

The other day Glen Nygreen said something about the difficulty of getting out of here to the East, referring to airplane transportation. And I, as a westerner, said I understood exactly what he felt. It is always difficult for me to leave the West, and I always come back to the West with pleasure.

That is the way I feel about NASPA. I feel genuinely sad when the Conferences break up and genuinely delighted at the prospect of looking forward to the next one.

Seven minutes. (Laughter and applause)

DEAN GLEN NYGREEN (Dean of Students, Hunter College, Bronx; NASPA President 1965-1966): I think Don DuShane has spoken truly, for it is not only the friendship and comradeship which marks the years that have passed, but it is much more, the confidence one gains in professional colleagues around the country to whom one must turn for sudden assistance numbers of times each year.

Given the probability of American students,

given the rapid interchange of faculty personnel among institutions, those of us who serve as administrative officers of colleges and universities find this knowledge of others and implicit confidence in their judgment we have gained from these shared experiences of tremendous help.

The problem modern NASPA faces is how to maintain this, as Dean DuShane has said we have determined to do, and yet at the same time advance into a newly complex and interdependent world, in which we must make substantive, intellectual and professional contributions.

The determination to do this led us two or three years ago to come to grips with two problems. One was that we must not become controlled by a Palace Guard of a few personable, able people, who could so manipulate their presidents and business managers that they were acceptable as Deans over a number of years, and by sheer longevity, therefore, came into positions of influence in NASPA.

Secondly, we wanted to be sure that we were not involved in a kind of cut-throat competition for status or power or popularity, or something of this sort, in the world of academic Associations.

So we began a thorough analysis of what we were as a contributing organization. I am not giving away any secrets when I say we found we were not much. We were a coffee klatch organization. We were having fun, and it was important for the reasons I have suggested, but not for the reasons we had hoped it would be.

We decided therefore, under the leadership of some forward looking Presidents of the Association, that we had better define our areas of work and then we ought to become, within those areas, task oriented.

At the bottom of page 12 of this pocketbook program which you have, you will find listed a series of meetings of NASPA directorates which are taking place at this very time, meetings which will carry over until five o'clock.

It is within these four task oriented work divisions that the leadership of the Association is currently being most effectively exercised. That is the kind of leadership that looks toward the future, about which Dean Williamson will speak in just a moment.

You will notice that the Research and Publications Division is meeting in the Pacific room. The

Research and Publications Division attempts to do two jobs, and because the Publications Division is really an independent entity -- you will notice just above it a meeting of the editorial board in the Evergreen Room -- this Division set up to survey the existing literature and asked the question: What is there that Deans need which is not being provided by other Associations' literature?

It was determined that what Deans need is a journal, among other things, a journal which is oriented toward the kind of daily, practical problems on the campus with which Deans must deal. We were not going to become involved in the warfare of the academic jungle which defines some problems as acceptable for scholarly endeavors simply because they are removed from the arena of daily activity, but instead that we were going to look along that pathway charted so ably by Ed Williamson at the dirty problems, and look at them in as objective a fashion as we could.

The NASPA Journal is one such result. It has now completed its third volume, and under the able leadership of Dick Siggelkow, I think you will agree that that Journal is moving into an area effectively which has not been covered by any other, and which is coming to be regarded with increasing concern and appreciation by Deans across the nation.

Another element of the Publications program had to do with a desire to look at some topics, perhaps by way of a bulletin or by way of a monograph series, which are not being covered elsewhere. The first one has just been printed. It bears the date June, 1966, Bulletin No. 1. It is authored by John Truitt, Vice President of Indiana State University at Terre Haute, and by Dick Gross at Wheaton College. I do not have the precise title, but it has something referring to inservice training programs.

Now, inservice training programs are occasionally referred to in the literature of student personnel work as desirable, but here for the first time, in one small volume, is a resumé of all that the literature has to say, a bench mark point from which we can all take off in developing inservice programs for our own staffs.

There are to be more, but this is just an example of the kind of thing this task oriented Division has been able to get under way.

In the area of research, under the very creative leadership of Peter Armacost of the Associa-

tion of American Colleges, formerly of Augsburg College, the Division of Research has been looking at some aspects of the position of the Student Personnel Administrator, which are otherwise largely ignored. Some of you have received some of the instruments and are participating in this research. It will bear a good deal of publication, which will be reaching your desk beginning in October, and I think you will find it stimulating to your work at home, as well as to your general professional thinking.

Then there is the Division of Professional Relations and Legislation. NASPA maintains membership in a series of national professional associations, such as the American Council on Education, and when testimony is being called for on matters of national policy which affect students, student welfare, that aspect of the campus structure related to it, this Division is ready to marshal resources to represent the point of view which we think is essential.

Now, by "we think" I do not mean the President of NASPA, or simply the directors of that Division. At this point I mean the kind of reading of the thinking of our membership which can be marshalled very quickly when necessary.

For instance, the Federal Government has threatened to remove the National Defense Student Loan Fund in favor of a guaranteed interest loan program. That threat was met by a solid congressional reaction, stimulated in large part by Deans and Presidents, and it was the Deans of our member institutions who carried to their Presidents and relevant academic officials the facts as we saw them, which I think were in part responsible for that reversal.

A third commission is the Commission on Professional Development and Standards. There have been attempts, a series of them in our history, to have one particular description for training particular student personnel workers to prevail. The expansion of higher education in our society has made this impossible. It seems that we in NASPA have been in a particularly influential position in trying to find areas of common agreement which were viable in the market place, as we looked forward to the years ahead.

Finally there is a division on Association Personnel and Services, of which Dean Earle Clifford is the Director.

My seven minutes are past, but I must take a minute or two to tell you the kind of thing that this sort of a division can do.

Let me just tell you that during a period of time when growing concern has been expressed about the use of narcotics and other dangerous drugs by college students, during a time in which the agencies of the Federal government concerned in these areas have been uncertain as to how to proceed, and somewhat negatively oriented toward college officials (feeling that they are not properly joining in a legal enforcement position) it is the work of Earle Clifford and his Division which has made possible for the National Institute of Mental Health, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department to cross governmental lines to join together in a common effort, using NASPA as the vehicle by which a program of education and action in this area in all colleges in the country can take place.

Those of you who sit in positions where this information goes across your desk will be the recipients of this, and the participants in its development during the year immediately ahead, and it is Earle's leadership bringing that about.

What I have tried to say, in just looking at these four Divisions of NASPA, rather than concentrating on many other things I could mention -- the International Affairs emphasis which Bill Blaesser is heading, for instance -- I am merely saying that NASPA has gone beyond the private club, jolly good time concept. We think we have come to the time where we have made some strides forward, where we are beginning to prepare the materials which can be useful to the working Dean, whether he is a new Dean on that desk in the fall for the first time, or whether he is a veteran with a large organization, a man who has held that position for a number of years.

I think you can take pride in NASPA. We hope, however, that as you give leadership to this significant professional organization, you will not choose status, position, recognition as the objective of what the Association is for, but that rather you will choose to work on the problems which face us, and ask the question, "How can we serve the world of higher education?"

Thank you. (Applause)

DEAN E. G. WILLIAMSON (Dean of Students, University of Minnesota, NASPA President 1966-1967): Mr. Dean, I would like to make three points in attempting to gaze into the future. They are, of course, extensions of the past, as all future is, but it seems to me that there are three emerging lines of development of our field that will have some significance, and perhaps a greater significance.

The first one is that our Association is now engaged in an effort to exert national leadership to establish "raproachment" among the periphery organizations on behalf of students.

As you know, there are quite a number of national Associations that might lead one to conclude that our field in the higher education is fragmenting. And this is true. And to too great an extent the fragments are insulated from each other at the national level in sharp contrast with the kind of coordination and integration that one finds at the local level on an increasing number of campuses.

This Association, along with others, is attempting to bring about a "raproachment" -- not organic unity, but the kind of fraternization across organizational lines which will reflect upon the effectiveness of the individual student personnel worker of all kinds at the local level.

We have, and will have in attendance here a very large number of officials of other organizations in the field of student personnel work, such as Dr. Willis Dugan, who is the new designated Director, Executive Director of APGA. There will be others. I hope that the kind of fraternization which will occur tomorrow morning and tomorrow evening, at special meetings of these individuals, will bring about the kind of conversations which will establish this kind of togetherness of the professional endeavors.

My second point applies equally to organizations such as ours and the others, as well as to individual student personnel workers. The phenomenon of the aging process brings about rigidity and fixity, and defensiveness of that which has been. What we need, of course, in our dynamic society, especially at this particular period in the exploding higher institution of learning, what we need is openness to the future.

What we need has been captured by John Gardner's little monograph "The Ever Renewing Society." John Gardner -- in sharp contrast with the pessimism of Toynbee, who feels that the decline and decay of a civilization is inevitable -- is trying to explore methods of keeping the future open to change.

I like to think that all of us in the field of higher education can become agents of change, desirable change, the ever-renewing openness -- so that we are always current with the contemporary generation, rather than trying to impose restraints, restrictions of the past upon this bursting kind of individual youth contemporary.

I like to think that this concept of the ever renewing society is equally applicable in the lives of the aging process of individual personnel workers. I hit upon, in 1926, a gimmick -- and we Deans like gimmicks -- a way of renewing my own youth, as it were -- not in Ponce de Leon's Fountain of Youth. L. B. Hopkins, one of the founding fathers of our movement -- first at Northwestern University, the first of this program of his kind in this country -- told me that he each year selected a likable, effective Senior and asked him to stay on his staff a year or two so that he, L. B. Hopkins, could renew his youth. I have always remembered that as one way of achieving John Gardner's "ever renewing society," applied to the individual.

My third anticipated projection into the future goes beyond technique and program, which we love to hammer out, to the slow, painful, confusing evolution of a philosophy of human development through the higher learning.

I have written on this in many articles because it seems to me to be unfinished business. Our movement began with doing something about human misery among students, and we have become technique bound, without thoroughly thinking through for what we are using the technique, in terms of the development of the good life, according to external criterion of excellence, as I have said elsewhere. I think we are on the threshold, as a movement, of evolving an articulated and sensible, meaningful and satisfying philosophy of human development, to give richness and purpose to all that we do in our daily work. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: The purpose of the preceding was to give you a feeling, a bit of the flavor of NASPA yesterday, today, and tomorrow. The expectation of the next fifteen to twenty minutes will be at least the hope that we can enter into conversations with you about any questions that may have arisen as a result of these comments, or perhaps were brought into the room with you unanswered, and are still unanswered.

Let me ask that those of you who have questions stand, or at least in some fashion waive your visibility so I can identify you, and when you rise, for the purpose of our recorder, that you indicate your name and the institution that you represent. You may address your questions to any member of the panel and on any topic that has anything to do with NASPA or the student personnel field, but most particularly the Association and your much anticipated supporting activity in it. We hope you focus attention on those questions. Are there any questions?



Because of the pattern of our hosting, which is experimental, we have among the audience a few who do not wear the green card. These people are a little more experienced in NASPA. They may have some questions, if not about their past experiences and therefore perhaps not directed to Don, they may have some questions about what Glen had to say, or perhaps about what Ed anticipated.

So let me invite their participation, as well as those who wear the green ribbon, although I will first recognize those with the green to the extent of my color blindness. Will that encourage anybody to speak?

Well, far be it from me to maintain in any formal pattern anything which has reached the point of terminal action. Let me turn to some announcements. These will be equally brief.

Let me also point out to you that under no conditions following that reaction to this panel, can you enter any kind of negative evaluation regarding the amount of time available for discussion. (Laughter)

Let me ask you to complete the cards and pass them in to the aisles, so that my one white and one green card assistant can collect them.

While you are doing that, let me ask you to listen with an ear, one, to these additional comments.

The task of running a Conference is a difficult one. There are a lot of details. One of them that particularly plagues the Conference Chairman is the problem of giving a commitment to the hotel regarding the numbers who will be present at meal times that are scheduled.

I am reliably informed that this is a present problem for our current Conference Chairman, and he respectfully requests that you complete your review of the program and in your decision making regarding plans to participate in the breakfast, luncheon and dinner meetings, that you implement that decision by purchasing a ticket so that the proper count can be passed on to the hotel.

You have had identified to you once already a fellow who has coordinated the hosting of those of you who are wearing the green card. This pattern is an experimental one, this approach of attempting to get an early relationship between members of the Association who have been to previous meetings with those who are attending their first one. Having lived together for at least a half day, it is an experiment.



Frankly, it is an experiment that was developed out of a conscious concern for preserving the flavor, that Don talked about with such feeling, about NASPA of the past, and that Glen identified as one of the objectives that we have sought during the course of our work this year.

I would appreciate it -- because this is a project in the area of my Division -- if you would find time to respond at least to your host, or to someone with the white card regarding your reactions to this experiment, and any suggestions for its improvement, because this purpose, preserving the friendliness and informality of the Association, is one we intend to keep with a high priority.

Eldon Nonnamaker, who was introduced to you earlier, is probably the best single target for you to approach with reference to this objective, and so I am going to ask him to stand one more time to be identified so that you can pass to him any reaction you have. Eldon, would you stand up one more time.

Eldon is the one who has coordinated this whole program for us, and if you have a reaction or suggestion, please seek him out.

Let me also point out to you that the meetings that are currently going on, of the directorates, the Committee on Financial Aid, and the editorial board, are not closed meetings. If you have special interests in any of these areas you are encouraged to follow the directions to the appropriate rooms, and sit in on those sessions. I would encourage you to do this because, as Glen has indicated, this is where a good bit of the present work and thrust of the Association is going on.

Could I have just a brief show of hands for the benefit of our current President, of how many of you in the room are attending your first NASPA meeting? [They raised their hands]

The President-Elect, on my left -- and I agree -- comments, "You must have some questions then." I am not quite sure whether the format of this room is conditioning this, or the presence of my colleagues on the rostrum, or what, but get into action on questions if you can. We still have time.

DEAN DONNA M. MEDDISH (Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon): Dean Clifford, I guess I will direct my question to Dean Williamson.

You referred to your anticipated coordination,

fraternization of other organizations to NASPA. I have heard the National Women Deans Association referred to as the counterpart of NASPA, and I am sure that this reflects the rather obvious male dominance of NASPA. My question is, has there been already any meeting between the Women Deans and NASPA? Do you expect a certain amount of coordination or fraternizing?

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: I think maybe I have the answer to your reluctance. You were all waiting to behave like gentlemen, and let the woman come first.

Let me ask Ed to respond to the question. The question is, there is an obvious male dominance of NASPA, at least in the room, and there was a projection that in the future there would be increased coordination. I think the word was even "fraternization" with other Associations. What are the present plans or previous contacts with NAWDC, the National Association of Women Deans, or Deans of Women, with reference to that project and that purpose? What is planned, and what contacts have been made? Ed.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: Well, there has been a good deal of informal relationship. I used the term "rap-prochement" rather than fraternization. I think it carries a little bit different connotation of equality, shall we say.

The President-Elect, Miriam Sheldon, will be here and take part in our program. I am pleased to be the first President-Elect to ask a woman Dean to serve on the Executive Committee of NASPA, Patricia Cross. She is here, and I hope this is the beginning of the opening wedge.

I said, "not organic union" because I do not think that we are ready for that, and we may never be ready for it. But it is a kind of relationship. We are all working for the benefit of our student clientele locally, and there is no reason why we should not do it nationally.

There is a plan being considered -- I do not believe it is fully consummated -- for a joint meeting in the same city of the Deans of Women and NASPA. I am not ready to announce that, but I think that is in the works. It is long overdue, in my opinion.

All these Associations -- well, not all of them, but many of them, for a number of years, have participated in what is referred to as COSPA, the Council of (different) Student Personnel Associations at the national level.

We, the Deans of Women, the Unions, Housing, and the like, have played a very active role in joint projects, such as a common core of training, at the professional and graduate level, and we undoubtedly expect to find other projects on which we can join together.

Does that get at your question?

DEAN MEDDISH: Very much so. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Do either of the other members of the panel want to make any comments?

DEAN NYGREEN: Just to say we are not reluctant, we are not adverse.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Glen says we are not reluctant.

DIRECTOR PAUL R. ADAMS (University of Calgary): Would the panel care to comment on the need or necessity of maintaining an academic affiliation in addition to performing student personnel administration responsibilities? I am thinking of a Dean of Students who is a professor in some academic discipline. Would the panel care to comment on the desirability or the lack of that kind of a relationship?

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: The question is, would the panel want to comment on the desirability of an individual member of NASPA who is qualified to have membership in an Association committed to, or directed in terms of interest or an academic discipline maintaining membership in that as well as NASPA. Is that correct?

DIRECTOR ADAMS: I am thinking of it on the individual campus.

DEAN NYGREEN: The individual's role -- does he play both roles?

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Do you want to comment on that, because of your fixed position, your variety of thoughts that I have previously expressed?

DEAN DUSHANE: I will give an either/or answer. I think it is a good thing to come to personnel work from the academic disciplines. I am a political scientist myself, before I was a Dean of Students, so naturally I would think that. On the other hand, I know of a good number of tragedies in which academicians have moved into top jobs in student personnel work, thinking they knew all about such simple things

as student personnel work, and finding out, unhappily for themselves and for many others, that they did not. So I think it is a situation which depends on circumstances, personalities, institutional background. I do not know whether this applies to your question or not -- good under some circumstances; tragic under others.

DEAN NYGREEN: Well, I have a fixed position about which I am going to say a little bit tomorrow. I am a sociologist. I am told that I must remind you that Time Magazine once defined a sociologist as a man continually astounded by the obvious. (Laughter)

My position is that student personnel administrators, and I would say all senior student personnel workers, must take an active part in the classroom where they are, really, in whatever discipline they have their training. I will have an opportunity a little later to spell out more "why".

I did this once at a similar meeting to this, at an earlier NASPA Convention. One of my colleagues on the panel said, "Sure, I agree with Glen. I would be glad to teach and be a dean at the same time, if I could do a good job of either one of them."

That implies, of course, the problem of the invasion of one's available energy and attention. However, I suggest to you one point, and shall leave the others for later, and that is that the insistent obligation or pressure which confronts both the classroom instructor and the student, pressures which cannot be set aside to handle an immediate emergency -- which is what the dean can do -- but these are the common lot of students and faculty, and unless we share in that common experience we are not really in a position to communicate effectively with them.

There are certainly a variety of other reasons, but my own opinion is convicted at this point.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: If you know us, you will know that the three of us who have been speaking are all from an academic discipline, and all three of us are actively teaching, I probably less than the others. Still I carry on a seminar and do occasional teaching elsewhere.

I am committed personally, and I have been committed in writing for some time, that by the year 2000 every personnel worker will have to have two doctorates, one in an academic discipline, and one in our field, if by that time we have sufficient graduate material to offer graduate work in personnel work.

Footnote: I am not sure we are yet there.

No, we belong to an academic tradition in which academic work is not confined to a classroom, in my judgment. I hope that learning goes on outside the classroom and that we facilitate it. I think we are entitled, and in fact I think we are obligated to contribute to the intellectual mission of the higher learning, but in addition, as I meant to imply, we also are teachers outside of the formal curriculum.

So, yes, personally I think we must be committed, but we must -- I think I would agree with Don that not just being a teacher qualifies you to be adequate in dealing with all the human misery that students encounter as they seek to grow up.

There is a tremendous body of knowledge accumulated in the last half century, about human development, a good deal of which is not known to many of our academic brethren. I do not say that in any arrogant manner, but I do think we have more than a bag of techniques. We have a growing technological development about human development through education, and we should be proficient academically in our own field, and in some part of the academic enterprise, as traditionally defined. We are taking our role in the academic enterprise, but I want to broaden it beyond the classroom.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: At the peril of projecting this panel as a packed court, and perhaps deviating from my responsibility as a moderator, let me add that we could have a fourth, because my academic discipline is sociology also, and I am currently teaching and I am equally committed to the principles that have been expressed here by the three panel members.

Are there other questions?

DEAN CLIFFORD L. ROGERS (Dean of Students, St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa): I wonder if we could assume that I have grey hair and that I am slightly bald. Could you explain to me why I should get an institutional membership in NASPA, because I have to explain that to my President. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: The question is, what should you express to your President as a reason for an institutional membership.

DEAN ROGERS: Yes, that is correct. What are the advantages of institutional memberships in NASPA?

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Well, I would begin by saying it is a bargain for \$50.00 with what you have to pay for other memberships in other organizations that

that are institutional. I am responsible for the Association's Division of Personnel and Services, and so at least to some extent I should respond from the standpoint of the latter of the two dimensions of my division responsibility.

You have already heard about the Journal and the kind of contribution it is making, and the Bulletin 1 with reference to inservice training, some of the activity which you will encounter in program materials at the meeting, opportunities to share with colleagues your problems and theirs, and get some of their answers, for at least adaptation.

The publications, the opportunity to be constantly in communication with the frontier of experimentation in research activity that is represented by our research division, the fact that there is, I think, increasingly substantial communication amongst the people who have the prime leadership responsibilities on each campus regarding both their problems, their prospects, and their progress, enable you to more effectively make plans to both anticipate and to program in a constantly changing and expanding situation, where all such information is not only useful but vital.

I think the task, flavor, and orientation of this Association in its activity program during the course of the year, and in the Conference organization, as it is established, plus such increasingly critical activities as those you will hear more about, for example, in the area of narcotics and dangerous drugs, will involve your institution on the threshold in the best, highest level presently existing pattern of communication among chief student personnel officers that is available.

Other associations in the field focus on individual memberships, focus on problems of the field that are, or tend to be, more oriented toward the individual's participation in the field than the institution's participation. It is the one association in the field that focuses on the institution's role in the field, and the field role in the institution, rather than the individual's.

If you look at the program that you are going to experience, and the kind of experience which I think some of you have had in the pre-Conference seminar, you will see at least two current exhibits of the kind of activity that I am talking about, which has value back home in ways which I suspect, come Wednesday, you will have your own answer to your President.

I am a neophyte to the Executive Committee, and I have a very modest role in the future, so it may have been a little presumptuous of me to respond, except in terms of my responsibilities for the services of the Association which, to me, spell in practical terms the advantage to the institution.

Let me ask either, or any of these Past, Present, or future Presidents to respond to the same question. Ed, do you want to take it first?

DEAN WILLIAMSON: As one Dean of Students whose institution has belonged from the very beginning, 1919, I would like to say that I feel like responding to this question much as I always respond when I am asked, or when I hear a comment, "Why should my student body belong to the National Student Association?"

If I may paraphrase a famous statement, it is not only what one gets, but what one can give. I have great personal conviction and commitment to joining and helping in any enterprise which will facilitate the maturing of our students into the kind of men and women that we can be proud of. I think this and other associations, in our peculiar American culture, have demonstrated clearly for over a hundred years that the voluntary associations do contribute significantly to the enterprise. And I want to be part of that enterprise. I take pride in it.

DEAN DuSHANE: I guess I can say to my President, if he were to ask me that question, "Look, Mr. President, the men and women who go to NASPA conventions and conferences, where I want to go, are facing the same problems, many of the same problems we have. Some of them are facing problems already which we are going to have in the future. There is no better place for this institution to put its money than to spend it by sending me to a place where I can get forewarned and forearmed."

That would be so far as Conferences are concerned. So far as the year between Conferences, I would say that the publications program, the opportunity to serve on commissions and committees is something that you will know more about as you go through the next few days.

The third thing I would say would be, I think every one of you is going to have a different set of answers to this particular question. Your President might ask you, but you are going to be (I hope) much better prepared to answer it on Wednesday of this week than we are on Sunday of this week, because your answer could have been tailored for your own particular president.

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD: Let me compliment the questioner, because if I remember my first -- then it was a Green Ribbon experience, and it was at Purdue and the number of Green Ribbon participants was small enough that we could go around and introduce one another, but I had that question in my mind. Not quite the same way, but with reference to my professional participation in the activities of this Association vis-a-vis other Associations, as an individual, with the limited time available, to know in what direction I should commit those energies, and I made the decision along these lines, for the kinds of reasons that I expressed, and to some extent that which was implicit in what Ed added.

Are there any other questions?

Hearing none, let me declare this session adjourned, and despite the fact that I did not welcome you formally, let me speak for all of us here on this platform, that we seek an opportunity to individually shake your hands before Wednesday.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

... The Orientation Meeting adjourned at three-ten o'clock ...



FIRST GENERAL SESSION  
OPENING DINNER  
Sunday - June 26, 1966

The First General Session and Opening Dinner convened at six o'clock, NASPA President Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Hunter College (Bronx), presiding.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Ladies and Gentlemen, will you please rise.

I call to the microphone Dean J. Elliott Cameron, Dean of Students, Brigham Young University, for the invocation.

DEAN J. ELLIOTT CAMERON (Brigham Young University): Righteous and eternal Father in Heaven, we bow before Thee this evening as we begin the first general session of this 48th Annual Conference of those who are engaged in the work with the young people of our society.

We give Thee thanks for the opportunities that are ours, and for the privilege we have of being here on this occasion. We give Thee thanks for Thy protecting care in bringing us here in peace and safety. We give Thee thanks for the bounties of life which are spread before us at this time, and pray that Thou will bless the food of which we are about to partake, that it may nourish and strengthen our minds and bodies, that we may use the strength in carrying on the work that Thou hast set forth for us to do, in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

... Dinner was served ...

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Ladies and Gentlemen, perhaps you would like to turn your chairs in this direction and make yourselves comfortable for what will be not a long, but an interesting program.

It is my pleasant privilege as the current President of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators to welcome you to the 48th Anniversary Conference of this organization, begun in 1919 as the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men.

It has not only grown perhaps more experienced and wiser with the years, but it has also grown in its understanding of its task and in its breadth of membership.

This is perhaps the last time that NASPA

will hold a June meeting. A number of years ago it was decided that if we were to -- and I must be careful how I say this. I have many friends from this, my homeland, in this room, and I used this phrase a while ago, and somebody caught me up on it. I said some years ago it was determined that if we were to hold meetings in the extreme corners of the country (laughter), and you see, my friends here do not like that at all. Of course, this is really the center of the country in my heart, and I hope in yours, after you have been here. (Applause) Thank you.

It was decided that if we were to do this, we could really hold the meeting best in June because many of our members could combine the Conference with a vacation trip with their families, see a part of this great country of ours that they had always wanted to see, and therefore make such a visit possible.

Our country has become such a closely intertwined web of inter-communications that perhaps it is no longer in order for us to do this, and it may be that our future meetings will all be in April, at about the time when college programs come to an end, staffs are being organized for another year, problems are being reviewed for attacks for the coming year, we could do this more agreeably and more comfortably.

It is also the time of year when a number of other professional societies meet, and many times our meetings can be combined with theirs. But at any rate we are here in Seattle, and I am delighted it is my privilege to be here on this occasion.

Because this is my homeland, I am, with the wise advice and counsel of our speaker of the evening, who is also an old friend who said he thought it would be all right, I am going to indulge in a small matter of personal privilege.

I do so because I want to make a point that busy and professional as we become, there is still a matter of personal example as inspiration and challenge which is still the most important factor in human life.

I was a student at the University of Washington in the depression, having come from a town some ninety miles north of here. I had no money. Tuition at the University of Washington in the winter term was then \$30.00, and the winter term arrived and I had no \$30.00. I not only had no \$30.00, I had no prospect of getting it. In a very discouraged fashion, I somehow got to the office of the Dean of Men. There was a chap there, an assistant dean of men, who had a little purse which had been provided for him by some

faculty and townspeople, and alumni, and after talking with me very briefly, he said, "Sign this paper," and he provided me with \$30.00 and I paid my tuition.

He did it in such an able fashion that when I still had not repaid that \$30.00 and had the same problem in the spring term, he, without much hesitancy, extended and doubled the indebtedness. Well, in the succeeding summer I paid it.

That man -- scholar, counselor, one of the most effective teachers I have ever known -- went from his post at the University of Washington to be successively Dean of Men and Dean of Students at the University of Idaho, Montana, Kansas State, and now he is the Dean of Students at the University of South Florida, in Tampa, Florida.

He is just an example of the kind of person who I think has been to each and every one of us in this room at some time in our lives, the kind of person whose thoughtful touch has made the next steps possible.

I just wish Herb Wunderlich would stand so I could just say "hello" to Herb. Hi, Herb.

... Applause as Dean Wunderlich arose ...

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: My task is first of all to introduce to you the distinguished people who crowd this head table. You will not again at this Conference see such a head table, and that is why it is here tonight. I would like them each to stand as I introduce them, excepting just one or two whom I shall save for later. I ask you to refrain from giving any applause until they are all on their feet, and then you may recognize them.

I should like first to introduce the distinguished President-Elect of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the Dean of Students at the University of Minnesota, Dean E. G. Williamson.

Next to him, the Program Director of the Association of American Colleges, the former Dean of Augsburg College, Dr. Peter Armacost. Please remain standing, Ed, will you? (Laughter)

PRESIDENT-ELECT WILLIAMSON: My feet hurt. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: On your right, on his left, the Dean of Rutgers University, with headquarters

at New Brunswick, New Jersey, Dean Earle Clifford.

The newly elected Vice President of our Eastern Region, Dean James Foy of Auburn University.

Past President of NASPA, and currently Regional Vice President for the Pacific Northwest, Dean Donald DuShane of the University of Oregon. Where is Don? (Laughter) We are a fine group, but every once in awhile somebody doesn't get to work. He is a political scientist. (Laughter)

Next, Dean Robert Etheridge, the Dean of Students, Executive Dean for Student Affairs at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; Chairman of one of our Divisions.

Dean O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men at Purdue University, a past Conference Chairman.

Father William Perkins, who is Vice President for Student Affairs at the University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, California.

The Director of our Placement Office, and the Dean of Students at Illinois State University at Normal, Illinois, Dean Richard Hulet.

The Associate Dean for Student Affairs at Howard University in Washington, D. C., Dean Carl Anderson.

The immediate Past President of NASPA, now the President of St. Peter's College in Jersey City, New Jersey, Father Victor R. Yanitelli.

The Conference Chairman for this Seattle Conference, Dean Thomas Emmet, Associate Dean of the McNichols Evening Division, University of Detroit.

On your left, on my right, Dean Carl Knox, the Secretary-Treasurer of NASPA, Dean of Men at the University of Illinois, and the right hand man for all of us in this society.

Skippping the next man, Dean Robert Shaffer, the Dean of Students at the University of Indiana.

Regional Vice President, Dean Joseph Cole, Dean of Student Affairs at the University of Rochester.

Regional Vice President and new Director of our Division of Professional Relations and Legislation, Dean Chester E. Peters of Kansas State University.

The Associate Dean of Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts, Dean William Swartzbaugh, our Vice President for the New England Region.

The Assistant Director of our Conference just completed, Dean John Gillis from Illinois State.

Dean Willard W. Blaesser, Dean of Students at the City College of New York.

Dean J. E. Cameron, the Dean of Student Affairs at Brigham Young University, who delivered the invocation this evening.

Our Co-Host, Father Robert Rebhahn, who is Dean of Students at Seattle University.

Dean C. Wm. Brown, Bill Brown, who is Director of our Pre-Conference, from Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

Dean Donald K. Anderson, Dean of Students at the University of Washington, who with Father Rebhahn are host deans.

A Past President of NASPA, Dean Jack Clevenger, Dean of Students at Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, who is Chairman of the Northwest Host Deans Committee.

Dean Eldon Nonnamaker from Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, who has been the New Members Hospitality Chairman.

Dean Rod Shearer from Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti, Michigan, who has served as Registration Chairman.

I have somehow skipped Dean Richard Siggelkow, Dr. Richard Siggelkow of the State University of New York at Buffalo, who is Editor of our Publications, and a man in whose debt we are very much.

I want also to recognize Dean Joseph Donoghue of the University of Detroit, who has been the Assistant Conference Chairman.

Tom Emmet, have I left out anybody?

Ladies and Gentlemen, these are the "brass" from this society. (Applause) It takes a lot of people to make an active association really active, and these are the people.

Now I want to introduce another series of persons who have honored us with their presence this

evening. These are people who represent some of the panorama of colleagues in related student professional personnel societies. I would like to introduce them one at a time. Most of them are down front here, and I would like to ask them to remain standing until all have been on their feet, and then again you may recognize them.

First, Dr. Henry Bruyn, Director of the Student Health Service, University of California at Berkeley, who is Past President of the American College Health Association, representing that group.

The far corner of the room. Theodore S. Cooper, who is President and new Executive of the Association of College Admissions Counselors, with offices in Denver, Colorado.

An old associate, Dr. Carl M. Dickinson, who is Associate Director of the Placement Services at the University of Washington, and is here representing the College Placement Council, Incorporated.

Another old associate of many of us, who is the new Executive Director Designate of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, with offices in Washington, D. C., Dr. Willis Dugan.

Mr. Robert W. Krovitz, President of the National Interfraternity Conference, a man who makes his home in Wollaston, Massachusetts, and who has shown by his attendance and concern at educational conferences his desire to take an active part in all our work. Mr. Krovitz.

Mr. T. Leslie MacMitchell, who is Executive Associate to the President of the College Entrance Examination Board, with offices in New York City.

Mr. Milton L. Nesvig, who is Vice President for University Relations of Pacific Lutheran University at Tacoma, Washington, who is here representing the National Council of College Publications Advisers.

The distinguished President of the Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Registrar of Purdue University at Lafayette, Indiana, Nelson Parkhurst.

I have to be careful lest I say all the things that are in my mind when I introduce the President-Elect of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, the Dean of Women at the University of Illinois, a friend of many of us in many situations Dean Miriam Shelden.

A young man who comes from Oregon, and who is the distinguished President of the United States National Student Association, Mr. Philip Sherburne.

The manager of what at the University of Washington is known as ASUW Activities, who is here representing -- I guess he is representing the American College Personnel Association, Dr. Ludwig Spolyar. Here is Lud, right here.

Representing the Association of College Unions from Oregon State University at Corvallis, Oregon, Mr. George Stevens.

The President-Elect of the Association of American Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Registrar and Director of Admissions of the Arizona State University at Tempe, Arizona, Mr. Alfred Thomas, is with us. Did I miss him? Right here. How do you do, sir.

Dr. Miriam Wagenschein, who is President of the Northwest College Personnel Association, Dean of Women at Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington.

I want to introduce along with them three members of NASPA who also are here representing other Associations: Dr. K. Patricia Cross, who is Director of College and University Programs for the Educational Testing Service. Dr. Cross -- back in the corner. Father Charles Dunn, Chairman of the Conference of Jesuit Student Personnel Administrators. Again, though he is at the head table, Dean James Foy of Auburn University, who is here representing as their President the Association of College Honor Societies.

While these people are on their feet, I would like to introduce, with a note of congratulations also, a former member of NASPA, member of Student Personnel Staffs at the University of Washington, at Purdue University, at the University of Southern California, whose promotion as Vice President for University Relations at the University of Washington was just announced yesterday, Dr. Robert Waldo.

Ladies and Gentlemen, these are our visiting dignitaries. (Applause)

Of course, I have left out someone. To all of you who will be attending the meetings of NASPA these next two and a half days will come a question as to who the gentleman may be who is always present and always working. I would like you to meet a man whose friendship with us, and whose careful service to us

long ago caused NASPA to recognize him with an honorary membership and a permanent invitation to be part of us, Mr. Leo Isen, who is more than a recorder, a great, dear friend. (Applause)

In the City of Seattle there is a great University which has grown from some days of despondency in the 1930s when it numbered an enrollment of just 30 students, to a distinguished reputation today with an enrollment of over 4,000 full time, highly qualified students.

Since 1956 the Very Reverend John Fitterer of the Society of Jesus, has been a member of the faculty of that institution; Professor of Philosophy, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, President since 1965. An avid golfer, an outstanding scholar, a warm and personable human being.

I am pleased to present to you, to hear greetings from the educational community of this city, Father Fitterer, President of Seattle University. (Applause)

VERY REV. JOHN FITTERER, S.J. (President, Seattle University): Thank you very much. President Nygreen, President Leggett, Members of the House of Lords (laughter), distinguished delegates, your wives, your friends of this 48th Annual Conference:

It has been given to me to welcome you to Seattle, and I am pleased to have been granted the privilege of exercising such a delicate chore. This is the first time that your National Association of Student Personnel Administrators has convened in Seattle, and it may be for some of you the first time you have been west of Pittsburgh. (Laughter)

One of our Jesuit faculty, who was brought up in Boston, returned there many years later to the land of Cod, as a priest and organized a reunion of his eighth grade graduating class. Reunions are seldom memorable, but this one was. One of his former classmates said, "I was surprised when I learned you'd become a priest. I'd always thought you'd be an Indian fighter." I'm happy to announce that the natives are not restless this summer. (Laughter)

It won't fill you with a burning desire to return to Seattle and the Northwest area some day in the not-too-far-off future to be told that Mt. Rainier is 14,410 feet high, that the Bonneville Power Administration had 9,327 circuit miles of high voltage transmission lines and 260 substations in operation on July 1, 1965, or that there are no north and south



directional prefixes on the street signs between Yesler and Denny Way, even since Dr. Leggett left town. (Laughter) For priceless items like these you can buy the World Almanac in the Seattle University or University of Washington book stores for only a dollar and a half.

Like any other city, Seattle has its blue skies and gray, its sunshine and rainfall, its good guys and bad guys, a little bit here and there of what might be construed as a slum. But unlike most other cities, Seattle is cradled in and surrounded by beauty. There are the ancient mountains and the high skies and the areas and courses of water. We have so much water that we refuse to sell anything else on Sundays. (Laughter)

Then, my friends, there are the correspondingly happy people, and their sons and daughters. These last are our glorious and your glorious concern.

Boys and girls everywhere, anywhere you find them, are an awful lot alike, like your students and like your children. And I would be surprised to learn that the student problems you confront on your campuses are any different from those current through the length and breadth of the land.

These problems are your business, but I would like to make it my business this evening in this welcoming introduction to remind you that there might be fewer problems if the students were less overtly academicized, if we Presidents would read the purposes of our organization and realize that there are more effective methods of aiding students in the intellectual, social, moral and personal development besides just pure academics. Books with print in them are highly desirable in a university, but a student is not made by books alone. Mental fitness is a waste of time, or at least dangerously close to a waste of time, if it is not complemented step by step by body fitness and what I would like to call soul fitness, and fellowship with learned faculty. Habits of health and prayer and beauty and creativity have a bearing on behavior and give the habit of study its real meaning.

I hope that the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators will never be taken to be a euphemism for strong-arm squad banded to enforce discipline for solving crises, and you will not be considered that as long as the liberating disciplines and the sense of disciplines I have touched on this evening are integrally instrumental to your accomplishments. So I would ask you to count your disciplines as you would count your blessings, and thus make

Seattle, to which I warmly welcome you and your speakers, the better for your having been here.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Father Fitterer, for those not only warm but wise words.

I cannot help but comment that it is not only the clear air and the clear water that impressed a number of members of NASPA, but it was the clean windows and absence of screens on the hotel that seemed to have impressed a great many also.

Tonight is a homecoming of another kind. Until a year ago our guest speaker was Professor and Provost at the University of Washington. He is now the distinguished President of Grinnell College in Grinnell, Iowa. An Ohioan who went from Middlebury College, and Ohio State University to a distinguished teaching career at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to the Ohio State University, and then to the University of Washington, he has demonstrated by his scholarship and by his leadership that he has represented the most admirable traits in academic man.

I recall when he first came to the University of Washington with an assignment which was -- or could have been -- an onerous one. He was put in charge of Freshmen English. As the University was growing rapidly there were problems with Freshmen English. As one of my colleagues once said, "Anybody can teach Freshmen English, and does." (Laughter)

Professor Leggett handled this very difficult chore with consummate skill, and when I attempted to recount this memory to him, of how well he had done that chore, he simply said, "It's fun."

I can think of no better way to introduce to you a distinguished scholar, a distinguished American educator, than by saying to you that he is the kind of person who looks upon his work as real fun.

I am pleased to present to this audience, and you to him, Dr. Glenn Leggett, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Dr. Leggett. (Applause)

DR. GLENN LEGGETT (President, Grinnell College): Thank you, President Nygreen. President Fitterer, President Nygreen, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is very good to be here and see you all here.

## THE HUMAN SIDE OF EDUCATION

As a sometime inhabitant of Seattle who spent thirteen years as a teacher and administrator at the University of Washington before being translated only a year ago to Grinnell College, Iowa, I think it not inconsistent of me both to welcome you all to this lovely country of evergreens, mountains, and mist, and extraordinarily hospitable people and at the same time to bring you greetings from the middle frontier state of Iowa, the land of tall corn and soy beans, of tornadoes and thunderstorms, of pheasants as big as Piper Cubs, (laughter) and of course of extraordinarily good educational institutions. (Laughter)

After a year's absence in Iowa, I must say I am disappointed to see my ex-colleagues at the University of Washington functioning efficiently without my encumbering help. (Laughter) But not really surprised. The real damage to my ego has come from my persistent inability to catch an edible fish in Seattle waters. My ex-fishing partners at the University of Washington have teased me several times about the calico bass, the catfish, and the horned pout in Iowa, but at least these fish do exist in Iowa waters. (Laughter) The problem there is to find an angle worm small enough not to eat the fish before you can bring it to the boat; (laughter) the problem here is to find the fish the natives keep bragging about. (Laughter)

Indeed, even when I was a bragging Seattle native myself, I couldn't find them, so that when good Dean Anderson of the University and I spent a day and a half last week touring Puget Sound waters, getting sunburnt and then wet and then sunburnt again in order to raise seventeen miserable dogfish to the top of the water, (laughter) I knew that my thirteen years of public relations lies for the State of Washington had finally caught up with me. (Laughter)

Progress at the University of Washington and misfortunes with fish were frustrations I expected to find on my return to Seattle. Frustrations with traffic in Seattle I had forgotten about. There are more cars in downtown Seattle circling a four-block area trying to find the access to the freeway than there are in the whole State of Iowa, (laughter) and there is more traffic at plane arrival time between the Seattle airport and the city itself than on any Los Angeles freeway at any time.

The people who build roads here and the people who are supposed to manage traffic in it are clearly experimental psychologists, (laughter) clever and merciless, (laughter) all engaged in a gigantic

research project to discover how much frustration Seattle human mice can take before they sell all their automobiles cheap to eastern Washingtonians who live, as they have for several generations, in that part of Washington where all the good roads are. (Laughter)

Iowans, I can assure you, would never put up with such nonsense; they have even been known to vote Democratic as a last protest against the encroachments of too much civilization. (Laughter)

Of course, all of this talk about personal frustration is ridiculously irrelevant to my reason for being here tonight. But I must say I enjoy it. Though I discovered last year that the delights and agonies involved in both private and public education are too similar to give any substantial comfort to one who switches from one kind of educational institution to another, there is a minor satisfaction in managing a private education institution. One can tell his elected representatives firmly that he is a taxpayer and an unhappy one instead of listening quietly and helplessly to the statement as it is directed to him by somebody else. Alumni, I have discovered, have the same low threshold of indignation as taxpayers, (laughter) but there is a quality of natural affection for the institution compounded with their anger that makes their complaints more palatable.

What it all comes down to is that it is pleasant for me to be able to sound off publicly in Seattle and then return to my job in Iowa in the smug security that no one can hold me to an unhappy accounting. (Laughter) It is almost like being a professor again. (Laughter)

Let me proceed now to what those of you who are amiably disposed might call my prepared remarks. When I tried to find a title for these remarks, I came up with something called THE HUMAN SIDE OF EDUCATION. I am not sure what I meant by it except that it has something to do with a gentle protest against the categorical imperatives, the brittle terminology, and the either-or generalizations we educators, both faculty and administrators, tend to brain-wash ourselves with.

Part of the idea for the title I had from a book called "The Human Side of Enterprise" by Douglas McGregor, who was both an academician and a corporate executive. The book was referred to me by a practicing clinical psychologist from the Menninger Clinic, a fact which might give me some temporary credit from you counsellors in the audience. But I should be honest enough to say that I read the book while

circling the Chicago airport in what Seattlites call a heavy cloud-cover and while trying to keep my stomach and my esophagus from pirating each other's functions, so that I cannot speak in much detail about Mr. McGregor's thesis. But I was intrigued by his notion that most organizations are really founded on the assumption that the people involved will not perform their best unless contained by rules and regulations devised by someone else and that, accordingly, it might be interesting to organize an enterprise or an institution on the assumption that people will do their best work if not placed constantly on the self-defensive. I can see some chaos resulting from a total acceptance of Mr. McGregor's thesis, particularly in an educational institution, but I think there are some lessons in his attitude for those of us who work in the complex organization that higher education has become and who, in spite of our best instincts, tend to categorize people as psychological or administrative problems and are always pushing ourselves to find simple answers to complicated questions and easy categories for clusters of irreducible facts and thus end in being something less than human.

For instance, take the matter of categories in kinds of higher educational institutions. If we start with the assumption that education in America is now an instrument of national policy, it is not difficult to accept the statement of John Gardner that the question of who is going to manage society has really behind it in our time the prior question of who is going to college.

And given our democratic society, the only humanly acceptable answer is "anyone who has demonstrated the capacity and interest." But because capacity is a term with degrees of definitions and interest a term with a variety of interpretations, it is clear that we need many different kinds of educational institutions -- large and small, public and private, secular and religious, vocational and academic.

Though the pattern of this variety is now established, and though the number of institutions satisfying the variety is increasing, we still have trouble with one another in understanding our separate functions and in improving the mobility of students from one kind of institution to another as their changing capacities and interests may warrant.

We would have less trouble if those of us in the profession of education would be a bit more human and gracious about the right of our sister institutions to be different and to determine their own integrity of purpose. We hear now the pronouncements

from universities that the small college is dying for lack of resources and competent faculty. We listen to some silly self-righteousness from four-year colleges that universities do not believe in teaching. We hear the patronizing words from both groups that community colleges are only remedial institutions, and we overhear some egalitarian asides from community colleges that they alone are really at the center of the American dream.

This is mostly self-admiring nonsense. Bigness and smallness and level of operation are not virtues in themselves, and to claim that they are, illustrates both the failure of our humanity and of our logic. What counts is the way size and function are used to do the job they are designed to do, whether it be to teach undergraduates or graduates, or to conduct research, or to serve the local or state or national community, or some combination of these purposes. The first question is whether the purpose is useful, the second whether it is being served effectively and honestly. And the answer to the second question will determine surely whether the first question was worth asking at all.

The desire of the human animal to create general categories and then argue in terms of them has of course its validity and usefulness, and I do not wish my remarks this evening to be read as an attack on Aristotle and most of the subsequent logicians of western civilization. I am sure their prestige will survive my speech. (Laughter)

But I am concerned, as I remarked a few moments ago, with what the comfort of categorical thinking may be doing to proper communication among our various kinds of educational institutions, and I am also concerned with what an easy acceptance of generalizations about the groups of people that make up a particular educational institution may be doing to its spirit and style. I mean generalizations about faculty, students, and administrators.

For instance, anyone who reads the educational press will find himself being persuaded that the following propositions are true:

First, that faculty are more interested in talking to other faculty than to students, and that research projects, not teaching, comprise the new academic status symbol.

Second, that students no longer accept the master-apprentice system on which American education is based and now expect their colleges to provide them

with the supposedly unrestricted society of Greenwich Village or the Sunset Strip.

Third, that deans and counsellors are unable to cope any longer with the problems of student sobriety and chastity, indeed even social manners, and are giving themselves over to full-time reading in clinical psychology. (Laughter)

Fourth, that presidents are more concerned with going off campus and listening to large abstractions about education than with staying at home and grappling with the concrete agonies in their own colleges.

To sum it all up, the propositions tell us that the academic constituencies, as they are often called, are said to be tired of being responsible toward one another. The wave of the future, we are told, is rolling on another shore -- the parade is marching down another street.

What the propositions say is sometimes true, and it would be foolish to deny it. But it is also naive to confuse reports of what is with the inevitability of what will be; and it is dehumanizing not to say irreverent to permit a kind of Nielson survey on what is being done now to substitute for what individual character can do when it wants to.

The term "irrevocable trend" is a before-the-fact headline, offering only a cheap predeterminism in a world of machines. Our job is to be people, human first of all, then hopefully more human. It would be well for us, therefore, to give up terms like "academic constituencies" and "educational segments," with their implications of disconnections and separate advocacy, and take another look at the term "community." The term is certainly very popular. We educators use it frequently, sometimes I think in inverse proportion to the speed with which our educational institutions appear to be losing it, a motion very similar to the history of the word "sincerity" in Hollywood and the word "integrity" in Congress.

The dictionary defines "community" quite pedantically as an "aggregate of organisms having mutual relationships." But this definition will do only for those more concerned with the letter of the word than its essential spirit. We ourselves know that it has something to do with the security of common purpose in which individual identity is preserved. We know instinctively when we belong to it and when we do not. We know too that most of us belong to several communities, from the family to the universe itself,



that indeed the world of communities is like a nest of Chinese boxes, each one slightly larger than the one it contains.

A college or university thus is not the only community. But it surely ought to be a distinctive one, because at its best it is committed to the sharpening of intelligence and its power to shape character and hence to determine the future. All of us educators need a re-affirmation of this commitment, a more earnest searching out of ways to develop out of our collection of faculty and staff and students a greater and more rewarding experience for all of us. We need to turn the collection of people into something more than the sum of its constituencies. We need, in short, the style and spirit of a community.

It is not an oversimplification, I think to say the failure of a sense of community is essentially the cause for today's "troubled campuses." But much of the cause rests not with any overt stupidities on the part of educators but with the rapid expansion of the nation's educational enterprise and the enormous problems that it has brought in managing communications, in developing a system of faculty rewards, and in conducting a growing range of responsibilities.

It has not been easy to find a way to feed and house and register and secure teachers for the flood of students that has descended upon us, and it has been even more difficult to persuade the general public to support properly the excellent educational system it insists, ironically, its children are entitled to. American educators have faced all of these problems honestly if not effectively, but while we have been dealing with them, the elements that make up our academic communities -- students, faculty, and administrative staff -- have become separatist and disconnected.

We are now generally in the unhappy position where each group is self-defensive and sentimental about its own problems and what it chooses to call thoroughly hard-headed about the other two groups. This hard-headedness, I think, is mostly a misnomer; it is really compounded of cynicism, lack of sympathy, and that old-fashioned hypocrisy that confuses the exercising of its own rights with natural law and eternal justice. Each of the groups, though especially students, tends to have a moral neutrality toward misbehavior in its own group that is matched only by its moral indignation about any mistakes or failures in the other groups.

The average political constitution of a



student government association, for instance, in its complex of legal pretensions and constipated committee structure (laughter) makes the bylaws of the average faculty or trustee group look like a simple recipe for cooking fried potatoes.

It is the existence of this same student mentality that delights in making outraged-idealistic noises about the complications of national and international society. The faculty, to carry the instances further, talks splendidly in faculty meetings about its rights in determining the quality of the academic community and of the dangers of turning the educational environment over to something it calls non-academic administrators and then to complain, with profound self-righteousness, about how much advising and committee work it must perform.

The term "teaching load," I can add, was invented by faculty, not by deans and presidents, and the implications of the term are realized by every student on every campus, whether we admit it or not.

As for we educational administrators -- deans, counsellors, presidents; that is, we who stand in the middle and whose principal job is to help students and faculty be responsible toward each other -- I think we frequently worry more about our continuing status in the organization than in getting the job done. The worry makes us human, for it is certainly difficult to live in an environment where most students tend to ignore us until they are in trouble and where a good many faculty members patronize us even when they do need us, but we are not really going to do anything either for ourselves or for the academic community we live in by telling ourselves sadly how little we are appreciated.

But I am indulging in the same kind of easy generalization and categorical thinking I was complaining about earlier, so let me return to my point that we ought to deal with people in the academic community as individuals and not in terms of an administrative problem.

We ought to give up both the sentimental attitude that students are a group of misunderstood angels with dirty faces and long hair and the cynical attitude that they are a new breed of youthful cat full of destructive impulses. As a group they are neither. As individuals, some of them are spoiled, ill-mannered, ill-kempt, with most of their brains in their noisy tongues. Let's admit it and take them on, as individuals needing their ears boxed, either figuratively or literally. But most college students, as

individuals, are remarkably bright and eager, trying hard to make sense out of a world they didn't make, a world whose complications, hypocrisies, and brutalities must seem overwhelming to them.

During their years in college they pass from adolescence to adulthood -- physically, emotionally, and intellectually. Given all the internal agonies they inherit as human creatures and all the external confusions the world has placed around them, it is a testimony to the Lord's Grace and their own inner strength that things come out as well as they do; and a testimony, I should add, to those of us in education who work and worry and believe that the best way to develop a competent, disciplined human being is to see that he is placed in the kind of environment and given the kind of tools that will allow him to the job himself.

It is the neglect of this environment by us educators, both faculty and staff, that essentially has brought us to the present agony with students, not some all pervasive, universal destructive instinct in students themselves. The truth is that educators, particularly college presidents, have given students the impression that students are expected to stand and wait and take their turn in the unpublished priority list of education's problems.

Students, quite naturally, have responded by going off and creating their own closed society, returning frequently and apparently systematically with a cluster of youthful demagogues to rap us educators sharply on the knuckles or in some cases to bring us to our knees.

We confuse what the demagogues say with what the students temporarily behind them think, forgetting that the essential qualities of demagoguery -- the preaching of hate, divisiveness, and the necessity of violence -- have not changed in at least two thousand years. In our terror, we respond by rushing to off-campus conferences again to debate the question what-to-do. It would be far better, I think at this too-late date, to stay home and have some eyeball-to-eyeball conversations with students, conversations in which we do more listening than talking, not chiefly to the words of students but to their heart beats. For I believe that most students have a natural respect for the validity of the master-apprentice system that alone makes education possible and, moreover, that most students have a very special insight into the nature of the college or university they are attending, an insight we educators tend to overlook because it is not articulated with the sophisticated propriety we admire.

I think too they do not mind being said "no" to when the occasion demands it, as it often does; that instead, like the rest of us, they want to understand the context in which it is being said and to be allowed the dignity of honest consultation. I think students really want to find a way to live in their educational community in both freedom and order as scholarly apprentices passing through what they have been told by all of us should be at once the most self-disciplining and truly liberalizing experience of their lives.

This experience is crucial, and the quality of it in any particular institution is determined by the way the physical environment, the students, the faculty, and we educational administrators go together; by the way in which, to say it as I did before, all these separate elements become a community greater than the sum of its parts. No single element or group by itself can create this community or keep it functioning.

Students, as I suggested before, have an instinctive awareness of what the community is and what it is not, but they are chiefly agents of it, passing through it quickly and losing their sense of local involvement at just about the time they are able to articulate it (unless of course they join that group known as permanent graduate students and present the irritating phenomenon of wanting to be taken seriously as masters before completing their apprenticeship).

In establishing and maintaining the community, faculty members clearly ought to have the most important function, and when they do function hard, as many of them do, the results are spectacular. A faculty member who teaches and writes and performs his duties in the academic community is one of the Lord's special angels and we ought to be grateful to him. But in the last generation, the pressures on faculty from their peer group, their system of rewards, their inherent conservatism have brought, as indeed a number of their own spokesmen say, an indigestion in the community, particularly the undergraduate community. This indigestion will persist as long as faculty members comfort themselves with the false hope that the academic and non-academic life of students is neatly separable and that they need not have any concern for the latter except to complain about the way deans and counsellors are mismanaging it.

But we educational administrators should remember that this attitude on the part of the faculty makes our job something more than merely difficult; it gives us our chief reason for existence in the first place. If we think of these two aspects of our work,

we shall be more sweetly disposed toward both students and faculty, who really deserve our love and respect as well as our head-shaking and sighs of resignation.

And we shall not fall into the trap of thinking we ought to run the institution by ourselves. Our job is not to make a cult of ourselves but essentially to use our positions both to loosen up and refine the procedures by which the elements in the academic community represent themselves to each other -- not only faculty-to-student and student-to-student but counselors-to-faculty and students-to-administrators as well.

What we need are systems of conversing with one another that are both flexible and precise. Then we shall be close to a style of operation that makes discussions and actions about a number of things natural and easy, among them student government, student journalism, student counselling, student study and recreation space -- perhaps if we are wise and graceful enough, even such hard-case items as faculty advising and the function of intercollegiate athletics.

In the last analysis, our job is not to fuss with the elements in the community and be self-justifying but to clear away the debris of prejudice and administrative frustration and get the right people talking to one another, so that the marvelously exciting potentiality of an environment of teachers, scholars, and students can be fully realized.  
(Prolonged applause)

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: President Glenn Leggett, I think the warmth of that applause indicates the aptness with which you struck a keynote for this 48th Anniversary Conference. Thank you very much.

I have some brief announcements. One I do not understand. (Laughter)

I am told to announce that the registration desk will be open at eight-thirty in the morning for any of you who have arrived too late to register this afternoon, and who would like to be registered before the first sessions tomorrow.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN EMMET: Tonight.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Eight-thirty tonight. I did not put down p.m. Eight-thirty tonight.

You are asked please to get your tickets for the meal events tomorrow as early as possible. This means that if you have not yet obtained your tickets for the breakfast scheduled for seven-thirty in the

morning, will you please do so tonight in order that the Conference Chairman may give proper assurances to the hotel management.

I am asked to announce that the elected members of the Nominating Committee will meet in the Board room at ten p.m. this evening, rather than at nine-thirty as announced.

Are there any other announcements? If not, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

... The General Session recessed at ten o'clock ...

---

GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION A  
Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966

"Current Federal Programs of  
Direct Involvement to Student  
Personnel Administrators"

General Information Session A, meeting in the Georgian Room, convened at eight-thirty o'clock, Dean William Knapp, Associate Director, Division of Student Personnel, Wayne State University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: This is a seminar on "Current Federal Programs of Direct Involvement to Student Personnel Administrators." I think this is what we do at the beginning every semester, every quarter, every trimester, so that everybody knows he is in the right room. The principal purpose is to relieve the frustration which has beset many people in student personnel administration, as a result of attendance at the Educational Opportunity Grant Workshops where they tried to take potshots at the boys from Washington, and were cut off. (Laughter)

There are no set speeches, you will be happy to hear. When you ask a question, will you give your name and the name of your school, or your association, and will you ask your question in sufficiently clear voice that I do not have to strain my rapidly aging ears.

Dick Cutler, who is the Vice President for Student Affairs at Ann Arbor, insisted there is no point in including stories in a speech, because it is not true that something in your speech reminds you of a story, and he always tells his stories at the outset.

I am not sure that the stories I have to tell are particularly applicable, but Jim Moore, for example, is held responsible for practically everything that happens in the area of financial aid in Washington somewhat unfairly, as this story portrays.

In Alabama there used to be a Dean of Home Economics, Agnes Ellen Harris, who probably did more for education of women in the South than any other single woman, and I mean single. (Laughter) In her efforts to describe the work she was doing, she always tried to include as many people in the honors as possible.

On one occasion she had a group like this, all the lady students at the University of Alabama, in convocation -- down here, a little sort of orchestra pit filled with the faculty, and up here on the

rostrum, Bill Tate, who had come from Birmingham Southern to be their president; Noble Hendrix, who had come to be their new Dean of Students, and (I suppose in the interests of budget) she had Shaler Hauser, the treasurer.

She went through her magnificent -- she looked rather like the "Winged Victory" (laughter) -- that is the Alabama corner over there, by the way. (Laughter) She had gone through this convocation with her dear girls, and she finally came to the family life program, the pre-school program, the human development program of the College of Home Economics. And she said, "This year, girls, for the first time in the history of the school of home economics, we have in our infant laboratory a five month old baby. Just think, girls, a little five month old baby. And I want you to know that Dr. Tate is solely responsible." (Laughter)

This has happened to Jim. (Laughter) He is solely responsible for the National Defense Student Loan program. He is solely responsible for the college work study program. He is solely responsible for the educational grant program. He is solely responsible for the trouble we have with our presidents. (Laughter) Just solely responsible, whether he was there or not.

About government relations, there is another story which occurred over in Georgia, around Tallulah Falls, which (in case you do not know where it is) is just about halfway between Clayton, Georgia, and Clarks-ville, Georgia. (Laughter) And if you do not know where they are, one is in Rabun County, and the other is in Habersham County, and they are about 110 miles northeast of Atlanta.

A man by the name of Phineas Scragg was named for the last word in the Bible. He was sort of a construction worker. My wife decided that in this little house she was building she wanted a dry rock porch. She came from Kentucky, where they had dry rock walks.

So they got flat rock from the creek beds, and as construction progressed they began to run out, and he said to the young architect who was looking after things, that he knew where there was some more flat rock, and he was asked where. He said, "Just over the hill yonder."

The young man said, "Well, Phineas, we can't take that rock. That's on the Tallulah National Forest. That belongs to the government."

And Phineas looked at him and said, "We're the government, ain't we?" (Laughter)

I think this story may have some application if you are going to move in.

The programs which are governmental, of course, far exceed the programs with which Jim deals, and with which Bob Goodridge -- whom some of you may remember as a colleague of ours from the University of Redlands -- deals in the Regional Office at San Francisco.

In the Financial Aid group that met this afternoon, we were talking about other forms of aid to students such as the permanent GI bill, the Social Security benefits which were increased a couple of years ago for young people in college, and a host of others, but it was by no means an exhaustive list.

We asked Jim and Bob to come and to answer questions which you may have about the programs with which they may be familiar. They do know something about what is going on in the facilities area, and that sort of thing, but they would prefer to respond to questions, or to statements acting as questions, which have something to do with the direct involvement of student personnel administrators.

Bob Goodridge began in the east -- at least he was educated at Denison University, prior to Mark Smith's time, I guess. He took his graduate work at the State University of New York, Buffalo. He has had experiences as a teacher and a counselor. He spent four years at St. Lawrence University at Canton, New York, which is distinguished by the fact that it is only twenty miles west of Knapp Station, New York; and he had eight years of Dean-type work at Redlands. As I say, he is currently with the Regional Office of the Office of Education at San Francisco, as a field representative.

Jim has gained his reputation for being responsible for everything that goes on by having been in Washington since 1960, first as Director of the Program Planning group, and of course more recently with the College Work Study Program. Along in there somewhere he was a special consultant to Edith Green's special subcommittee, weren't you, Jim?

DR. MOORE: I helped.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: He helped consult.

From 1955 to 1960 he was responsible for setting up and getting underway the state scholarship program in California, which those of you in Financial Aid will remember sort of set bench marks for the rest of us as our states developed similar programs.



Like Bob, he has had teaching and counseling experience, and, like Bob, got his undergraduate education in Ohio at Oberlin, and did his graduate work, like so many of the rest of us, at the mother of us all, Teachers College at Columbia.

He is married and the father of four children.

What about you, Bob?

DR. GOODRIDGE: Just married, that is all.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Just married. It does not say so in the official notes about Jim, but he also sings in the choir.

Now we are prepared for your statements as questions, or your questions about the Federal programs which directly involve the Student Personnel Administrator. This year's questions, next year's questions.

DEAN FRANCIS E. SMILEY (Colorado School of Mines): I was wondering where we stand on the guaranteed loan program at this point?

DR. JAMES MOORE (Director of College Work Study Program, Division of Financial Aids, Bureau of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education): Bill just said "next year's questions" and not the one for five years from now.

The guaranteed loan program is being developed. We have signed agreements with about 26 states where a state agency is to function as the guarantee agency in the state.

If I remember correctly, last month the United Student Aid Fund people signed a general agreement with the Office of Education which will allow them to operate as a private non-profit agency in lieu of a state agency in all the rest of the states.

From a structural standpoint, we are ready to go in so far as the payment of interest subsidies is concerned, on loans which will be made for this next college year. There is still, I regret to say, some question as to the extent of the interest subsidy on loans made wither by U.S.A. funds, or by certain of the state agencies for this past year. This one really has not been resolved as yet.

Hopefully, within the next three or four weeks, the distribution of what we call "seed money"

will begin. This is, roughly, the seven or seven and a half million dollars which is to be allocated among all of the states to be used as a basis for guaranteeing loans for next year. The mechanism has been designed for payment of the interest subsidy.

It will involve a computer generated system of payments which go directly into each of the lending institutions, banks, savings and loan associations, or credit unions, once every three months. In turn, the colleges will be asked for a twice a year report on the status of all the borrowers. This is to be done on an ingenious list, really, that shows all of these borrowers, that shows a code over here for the institutions, which shows that the borrower is still there, if he has left, and if he has left what the reason is.

Seriously, a good many skilled people have been at work on this system for the last four or five months, and with all of the genius that there is in the IBM Corporation and in the Office of Education, and other places, I think it will work.

Two weeks ago the American Banking Association met with the President to present the first copy of a very well done brochure which has since been sent to 13,000 banks across the country, and from which the local banker may take a little slip and send it in to ABA headquarters in New York and get back a kit of materials explaining the program and its operation. This includes, of course, the usual set of Federal regulations, those International "Best Sellers" which we put out from time to time in Washington, as well as indications as to which agency in the state will handle the guarantee business.

I believe the decision has finally been made as to what the definition of "\$15,000 per annum adjusted family income" is. At least, as of Friday afternoon there seemed to be a general blessing, as it were, on this one. Basically, it will involve the use of line 11-d, I believe, on the income tax form, which is the amount of money on which the individual pays tax. If this amount is \$15,000 or less, the student from that family is entitled to the interest subsidy.

Conversely, a ceiling has been introduced to preclude people with incomes in excess of half a million dollars a year, but whose net taxable incomes are only \$11,000 a year, from being involved in the program. This, as I best recall, says that the gross income of the family, minus the personal exemptions -- that is, for the taxpayer, his wife, and dependent children -- cannot exceed \$20,000. Once the ceiling has been met on that score, then you look at this

taxable income figure, and if that is under \$15,000 then that student is locked into the interest subsidy business. This information will be derived from the most recent year's income tax which, in the case of these loans, will be for the tax year 1965.

As I said before, the mechanism is pretty well nailed down, and from this point on, as far as we can tell, the ball is in the hands of the bankers and other people who have the capability of making loans.

Very many people have told us very many things as to whether or not the bankers would or would not support this program. The ABA people did tell the President that the whole organization was pretty well committed across the country to building portfolios of these loans, and presumably that will be the case.

I happen to know that in Colorado next Thursday there is to be a conclave of the banking people, Mr. Ogle from our office, people from the United Student Aid Funds, and numbers of Financial Aid people throughout the state, to discuss the beginning of the program in the State of Colorado. As far as I can tell, there has been a good deal of interest expressed on the part of Colorado bankers.

Basically, this is going to be a kind of a "wait and see" program, because its dimensions are such that all of us are a little bit staggered by it. As I said before, the real key to the whole thing is the extent to which private capital has moved into this kind of lending activity.

That is a long answer for a short question.

DEAN SMILEY: May I have the privilege of a follow-up question?

DR. MOORE: Surely.

DEAN SMILEY: We have received inquiries from some high school people saying, "We understand you (the college) have application forms for these." We, of course, do not have any. How is that machinery going to work? Will the bankers have them?

DR. MOORE: The bankers will have them, and it depends really on the kind of distribution pattern that is set up by the state agency.

DEAN SMILEY: I see, this will be in the state hands?

DR. MOORE: The USA people could elect, and I think they probably will, to distribute these in quantity around through the institutions of higher education in the state, as well as the banks, and perhaps even other organizations. But this comes under the bailiwick of the state operation.

DEAN ROBERT MOORE (Arkansas State College): There has been a confusion about USA participation in this program. Is it anticipated that this "seed money" from the state will be the deposit with USA, or what is it?

DR. MOORE: The question is, will the State share of the "seed money" become part of a deposit with USA funds?

In those states in which USA is functioning as the agency, they will place on their books this total amount of money. One of the problems that I guess is not yet resolved is the question as to how that endorsement capability is distributed among everybody in the State. At the moment, it looks as though these loans will probably go on a first come, first served basis, because there is no rational way that anyone has yet been able to come forward with that would indicate how to parcel it out among institutions or among people.

One of the basic sources of confusion which keeps popping up all over the place is whether or not the college, in order to have its students participate in this program, is required to make deposits of its own money with United Student Aid funds, and the answer to that is "no." The college may elect to do so, if it wants to, but in fact there is an express prohibition against any public or private non-profit agency requiring the institution to put money into it.

There is one other point I should make clear, just to add to your confusion. I think it is obvious to most of you that seven and a half million dollars will underwrite only about ten times that amount of loans, or \$75,000,000.00. This is less than a third of what all the colleges intend to do with NDEA next year. So the "seed money" is going to be very quickly exhausted and presumably this will happen while there is still a pretty heavy demand for loans in the state.

As soon as the endorsement capability is run through -- that is this Federal deposit -- the Commissioner and the Office of Education are required by law to begin to operate the direct Federal insurance program of these loans, which means, from a practical standpoint, that we substitute for the guarantee an

insurance certificate issued by the Commissioner, which underwrites or endorses the loan, if you will. The student will pay a fee of up to half percent per annum of the amount he borrowed to cover the cost of this thing.

We are ready now to move this operation off dead center within the next six weeks. Our feeling is that we will probably have to do it by no later than the middle of August. So we think that virtually in all the states before the school year has even begun there will be a pattern of these insurance certificates in place all over the country.

DEAN ROBERT MOORE: Will the USA fund still charge a fee?

DR. MOORE: An application fee?

DEAN ROBERT MOORE: Yes.

DR. MOORE: I have forgotten on that one. This has been a source of contention as to whether they could or could not. I would have to go back and see what was in that agreement that they signed.

Our legal people were disposed to rule against this mandatory fee on the grounds it was over and above what the law required the Agency to do. There was also some discussion about whether or not this fee type of thing could not be subsumed under a kind of service charge notion that might be levied by either a public or private non-profit agency as part of the cost of doing business in the State. But I do not know the answer to that one. It will, however, be made clear in the USA regulations or ground rules that are issued in the states.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Bob, do you anticipate that Arkansas will have no official state agency except USA?

DEAN ROBERT MOORE: Right.

DEAN ANDREW C. COGSWELL (University of Montana): This "seed money," Jim, this is not a gift, this is an obligation of the state to the Federal government, is it not? It has to be paid back?

DR. MOORE: We are going to have a meeting on that tomorrow morning, on that very question, (laughter) because the law talks about "advances to states." This is the language of the law, and presumably once money has been advanced to a state there is an obligation of the state to restore that money sometime. The problem at the moment is that nobody is clear as to

when that "sometime" is, whether it is 1990, or 2000, or what have you. We are going to have to clarify this because the problem keeps surfacing in these agreements that we are now going to sign with states as to what the obligation of the state is to maintain the corpus of this advance money intact, over the period of time that it has the funds.

DEAN COGSWELL: It becomes a legal problem in some states.

DR. MOORE: That is right.

DEAN COGSWELL: As to whether the Governor can accept it without the approval of the legislature.

DR. MOORE: This is true. And if so accepting, is he pledging the credit of the state in accepting this ad infinitum. It is a sticky question.

DR. ROBERT GOODRIDGE (Field Representative, Western Region, United States Office of Education, San Francisco, California): May I ask a question? We get all our information from Washington, too, you know. Is it true that a bank can refuse a student a loan?

DR. MOORE: Yes. A bank can refuse anybody a loan.

DR. GOODRIDGE: On this program?

DR. MOORE: They can refuse it on this one if they elect not to.

DR. GOODRIDGE: Then the student can go to the government?

DR. MOORE: Well, let me back up on that one. There is nothing in the law that compels a lender to make a loan to any student. The guarantee agency in the state may not refuse to issue the endorsement, the guarantee, or withhold it by reason of lack of need if this income level test has been made for the interest subsidy. But that is quite different from the decision of the banker himself. He may decide he just does not like the student. No loan. And there is nothing that says that he has to loan to him. I guess the idea is if he cannot get a loan in Friendly Bank No. 1, he goes on down the street until he finds some.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: That is one suggestion that has been made, that even in those banks which have exceeded what they consider their permissible lending capacity, that with this program they can do that.

DR. MOORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: And will feel much more comfortable.

DR. MOORE: I think this is true.

DR. GOODRIDGE: Then when this "seed money" runs out, have any steps been taken as to the organization of the program when the Federal government gets into this insured --

DR. MOORE: Yes, we have a unit that will handle this, and it is in place. From a practical standpoint, the "seed money" is all gone, no more endorsement capability in the state, and you as a student come into the Friendly Knapp Trust, in Detroit, and here the bank is willing to make you the loan, but there is no capability in the state, so they apply and receive from us a certificate of insurance. The mechanics are a little bit different in so far as underwriting the loan is concerned, but everything else works the same way. Your interest is paid just as if your loan had been guaranteed by the state agency.

DR. GOODRIDGE: The institution does not enter into the program?

DR. MOORE: Yes, the school is very definitely in it. The school must (1) certify that the borrower is enrolled and in good standing.

(2) The school will be asked to stipulate what it costs to go to school. Actually, we have most of that data now. How reliable it is is still a question, but they gave it to us back in January.

(3) The institution will be asked to tell the lender the amount and type of other financial aid which is given the student. There has been a lot of confusion about this program in terms of students being able to simply borrow the money willy nilly anywhere, whether he needed it or not, and whether he had other forms of aid.

(4) The loan cannot exceed the difference between the reasonable cost of going to school and whatever other support has been provided, except for support from the parents, whatever that net gap is in there.

DEAN WHEADON BLOCH (University of Missouri at Kansas City): How is that consistent with the no need assessment?

DR. MOORE: "Need" refers in this context to the -- it is going at it in the wrong way, but it

is the capability of the parents to support the student in school. A student is needy if his parents cannot support him. If they can support him, no need exists.

This program, by and large, was designed to provide long term credit to replace cash contribution by the family. In that context, it is not a financial aid program. It is simply long term credit business.

The reason for the introduction of cost up here, and the other forms of aid down here, was to simply preclude a youngster who was attending an \$1800 a year college, and who had already received through NDEA and work study, let us say, \$1200 in assistance, from borrowing \$1,000 because at best he requires only enough money to meet the \$1800 tab. If he already has \$1200 worth of aid, the only gap in here to be filled is \$600, and that should be the top on the loan.

You still do not believe me, I can see that.

DEAN BLOCH: No.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Isn't it a fact that the guaranteed loan program, not being a program of student aid in the sense in which we ordinarily understand it, is partly responsible for some of the complaint that has been uttered about phasing out National Student Defense loans, that this program was not meant in any way as a substitute, because it is based on an entirely different philosophical approach. Under the National Defense you give a student no more than he needs, and under this you just arrange for him sort of to be more comfortable.

DR. MOORE: Yes, I think this is fair, or you allow the family to borrow rather than taking out of income.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Yes.

COUNSELOR ROBERT E. TYLER (University of Alabama): I make a suggestion that you not have a conversation between you up there. Make it so that we all can hear.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: These are not very good microphones. Will you complain to Tom Emmet. (Laughter)

DEAN ROBERT H. EWALT (Washington State University, Pullman, Washington): To get back to probably a very basic question here, we have been involved with USA for four or five years, and we have about \$12,000 or \$15,000 invested in the program as such. Do we start over? Do we withdraw, or continue on this basis? How do we get ourselves up-to-date with the new program?



DR. MOORE: That is another one of those good questions. An institution that has been in USA funds obviously can continue, and could -- provided the student met these income level tests -- blanket your USA loans in under the interest subsidy.

The kicker in this one -- and it is one we have to straighten out -- is that obviously you have used some sort of need assessment before you tabbed somebody for one of your USA loans, and presumably would continue to do that.

There appears to be a conflict in the law with respect to no need assessment by virtue of family income on loans that are to be brought in under this program, and this kind of activity which probably goes on under USA.

All I can say at the moment is that very quickly we are going to have to issue some directives to institutions to indicate what the alternatives are here with the USA people operating with Federal money over here, and the same institution operating over here with its own money on deposit with the USA funds. As I think you quite probably see, there can be a difference here.

Mainly, I think it is a question also of control. Under this seed money drill in the hands of USA funds, as an institution you have no control over that money to the extent that you can say, "Student B, go on down here, we have set up a loan of \$1,000.00." But if your money is on deposit with USA funds, you obviously control every nickel of it and can decide who gets the loan, when, and so on.

My own guess is that since the bulk of the people that you probably have on USA fund loans already would automatically fit within this interest subsidy criteria, that you would just continue to operate your program, you know, as side by side with the other one. I think this is the way it washes in the long run.

DEAN THEODORE H. SWENSON (University of California, San Francisco): I am somewhat concerned over the problem of having control of need assessment rest with the particular campus involved. In this connection, I understand there is legislation before the Congress now, at least in regard to the health-science areas, which would enable an institution to arrange to borrow funds which then would be guaranteed by the Federal government, and consequently subject to control of the institution involved. Presumably, the rationale for doing this is that it is desired to shift the responsibility for providing loan funds from the

Federal Government to private industry, which seems to make good sense, if it will work.

I wonder if you have any observations on this, and how it might relate not only to the health-sciences as a technique, but perhaps to aid programs in general, and maybe even the guaranteed type of loan program.

DR. MOORE: There has been a feeling in various levels of the government that to the extent possible credit programs operated by the Federal establishment should be based on the private sector rather than on the public sector. It is part of current budget philosophy, and some other things, in terms of fiscal management.

Last winter when various alternatives were being considered as ways of supporting the NDEA, but without the need for a direct appropriation of Federal money, this was the one that was brought up most often: Allow or provide, if you will, the capability for an institution -- that is the college -- to secure all of the loan funds it needed from the private sector, and then run a Federal guarantee in underneath that amount in order to enhance the lending capability of the institution, if you will, and perhaps make the flow of funds a little easier. This notion, when proposed to the House of Representatives in March as a way of financing the NDEA, was rejected by the House Subcommittee on Higher Education.

The health provisions legislation does not go through that same committee. It goes through Foreign and Interstate Commerce, for a number of reasons which I am sure would amuse all of you, but it would take me from now until midnight to tell you.

However, this committee felt this might be a workable method and approved the idea. The question as to whether it will work or not is another one that I cannot answer, and I do not think that anyone else can, because it involves diverting a large chunk of private capital into an area that traditionally has been supported by direct appropriations.

There was some concern, and this was so expressed to the Green Subcommittee, as to whether the private sector could at one fell swoop take over, in addition to this new program, the heart of an institutionally operated activity in terms of supplying the funds to it.

Quite apart from this concern nationally, there were other concerns as to whether this would

work equally well in all sections of the country for all institutions, because of differences in the money market, money supply, and so on.

As far as the institution and the student are concerned, I think you come out the same way, whether the money goes in via the direct appropriation route or whether the money is borrowed from Wells Fargo, with a Federal guarantee, and the loan then made to the student. Obviously, the risk that the institution runs in terms of its being able to support a loan program is much higher where it has to deal on the private market versus the present system, where all colleges make applications to us and we dole the money out.

The future of the NDEA, at least as far as the major source of capital in the fund is concerned, is still under study. Nobody at the moment knows what kind of recommendation may be sent to Congress next spring, or whether one will go at all.

A large part of the question hangs on what happens in this guaranteed loan program this fall and next spring. My own guess is that it will take at least two or three years before the college controlled loaning to qualified needy students has really settled down, and a pattern that is going to stay with us for a long time has clearly emerged.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Jim, do you mean that there will always be sort of a hard core of needy students to be handled directly by the institution?

DR. MOORE: This seems to be a kind of irreducible minimum in this thing. No matter how you cut the credit picture, virtually every college will say that we must be able to make so many loans each year to a certain number of students for these reasons -- which is kind of an absolute demand for some sort of an NDEA.

Along with that is the fact that by the end of next year -- that is a year from right now -- the capital in the NDEA fund will approximate \$1-billion. This is paper in the hands of the colleges. One school of thought says, let's cut the umbilical cord that ties that fund to the Federal government, and leave that out there as a revolving fund, which is all right, except for two or three things:

1. It only revolves about twice in every generation, which takes too long to turn the whole thing over.

2. In those institutions to do a basic job of training people for teaching there is an automatic drain on this fund that just almost wipes it out. I was in an institution in Colorado, as a matter of fact, the first part of this week or last week where teacher cancellations, as opposed to cash payments run something like nine to one. In a school like this you might as well forget about a revolving fund, because there would not be anything there to turn over. It has all been written off.

So if it is maintained -- and there seems to be reason to believe that this might happen -- there still has to be some way to keep pumping money in those areas where the drag on the capital is such as to reduce the fund to nothing all the time.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: There would be those who would say the thing to do is change the teaching institutions into liberal arts colleges.

DR. MOORE: There are those who would say that, that is right.

DEAN SMILEY: We have 40 or 50 percent of our students who are out of state students. I have been telling them that when and if the guaranteed loan program comes in they will make their application in their home state. Am I right?

DR. MOORE: You are right. Residents of each state are eligible in that state and are to borrow there. This is the friendly home town banker notion, which I guess works.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: If the notion does not exist, the guaranteed loan program would not.

DR. MOORE: That is right.

DEAN ANDREW C. COGSWELL (University of Montana, Missoula): We have a lot of students who do not have home towns.

DR. MOORE: Andy, everybody has a home town.

DEAN COGSWELL: You would be surprised how many students do not. Their parents have moved from a community. These kids have been in the army, come out and gotten married.

DR. MOORE: Then the home town is Missoula.

DEAN COGSWELL: They are non-resident students as far as we are concerned, on our books. They

will say, what town can we borrow from? That is where your NDEA program is important to us.

DR. MOORE: Right.

DEAN COGSWELL: This is a transient society we are in now.

DR. MOORE: That is true. For these kids who are coming back from the military, who are 21, 22, 23, 24, you are right, this is a real problem.

DEAN COGSWELL: They are born some place, but nobody remembers them.

DR. MOORE: My classic example of this is a kid who was only 18 years old and had never been out of the State of California in his life, but due to certain high jinks carried on by his mother, which I will not go into, he was a non-resident, which I found a little difficult to understand, but this is the way it works out. The mother kept getting married all the time to people who lived other places, and often without benefit of going down to Tijuana for the divorce. This poor kid kept getting made a non-resident all the time, which really is not the way to do business.

DR. GOODRIDGE: How about a provision on this new guaranteed loan for teacher cancellation? This was in Congress, I know. Do you think maybe it might be passed eventually?

DR. MOORE: Not that it is not a good idea, but the cost would be prohibitive, and the administrative problems -- well, you people in the colleges know you have had to wrestle with this cancellation thing, and the problems that it would pose to banks, I think would be almost insurmountable. As far as I know, nobody is pushing this with any degree of success.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Is Mrs. Green still pushing for removal of the cancellation on teachers?

DR. MOORE: I do not know how she stands on that one at the moment.

DEAN MOORE (Arkansas State College): The work study, is there any anticipation that it will be expanded, or will it reach a plateau here at some point? What is the expectation on this?

DR. MOORE: The work study legislation has about two more years of life left, as far as the higher education act of 1965 is concerned. There are really two problems here. One, the extension of authorization

to run the program; and, secondly, whether or not the matching ratio remains as it is in the present law, and changes in August of 1967 to 25/75.

The way it has caught on this last year, since the bill was changed, leads me at least to expect that the Congress will probably give pretty heavy support to this one, and certainly to the extent that they can find money in the budget to support it, continue to expand it.

This is still a program with a lot of other unanswered questions in it. One that interests me no end is the extent to which any given college can expand employment opportunities ad infinitum, because I think there is a saturation point in virtually every school. I do not know what it is, but I think it is there.

On the other hand, as we know, in the State of Arkansas if we get into things like Arkansas plans, one can expand employment all over the place without even touching the campus activity, because you have all these community placements operating.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: The comment about the change in the law affecting college work study raises a question about the gossip level comments that are being made, "Economic Opportunity Act will, in the guideline stage at least, undergo a change having to do with a relative aspect of the cost of attending various institutions as against the sort of absolute that applies now." Is there anything to that?

DR. MOORE: Not that I know of at the moment. We are not gossiping in the same circles, I guess. But given the background of that program, and the way the legislature was set up, it looks to me that at least in the foreseeable future -- let me put it this way: Until the evidence is pretty clear that the support requirement for the very poor student has been met, there will not be much disposition on the part of Congress to begin to shift this into a merit type, or a California operation, if you will, which I think is what you meant by "relative need" as set by the cost.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Yes.

DR. GOODRIDGE: Jim, don't you think that if anything was done to try to cancel out this work study program we would find ourselves in even more of a turmoil than we did this last year when they tried to quit the NDEA?

DR. MOORE: I suppose so. Certainly the flap that was generated in January and February by

the American colleges over the NDEA was louder and more heated and noisier than anything anybody anticipated. It could well be here that in another major program where this next year will have an institutional commitment at the level of roughly \$150-million -- that is \$135-million Federal and \$15-million out of institutions -- the idea of simply terminating this without replacing it with something else would generate, I think, the same kind of reaction. Certainly it would if it happened this next year, or a year after the NDEA business. I am sure that would be the case.

DR. GOODRIDGE: The reason I asked the question is that in visiting various campuses in Region 9 on the West Coast here, I find that there is more enthusiasm generated for this work study than there has been for really any of the other financial aid programs that we have had.

DR. MOORE: To what do you attribute that? The brilliant administrative leadership from Washington? (Laughter)

DR. GOODRIDGE: To our leadership, Jim. (Laughter) No, I think that the general principle of work study has been accepted better. For example, I do not think that any administrator in the institution liked to see the student graduate having an obligation of \$4,000 or \$5,000 which the student has to pay back, or start paying back over the next ten years.

Let us say, for example, a girl graduates owing \$3,000, and she marries a fellow who has borrowed \$5,000 from NDEA, and together they have an obligation of \$8,000, which is no way to begin married life.

If they can both work, and keep their obligation down to a minimum, that is good. Not only that, they have contributed something; they have earned part of their education. They have learned something on this job experience. In addition to that, many of them have contributed something to the institution or the community where they have been working.

This program has been accepted, from my observations, far more than the loan program.

DR. MOORE: This is good to know.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: We had a meeting of the Financial Aid Committee, and somebody commented that as soon as NDSL came into being it was looked on exactly like welfare almost. You know, it is free money, and all you have to do is be poor to get it, and that is it.

Of course, we are all familiar with the fact that a lot of people thought they would never have to repay it.

Another thing that has been lost sight of -- and I assume this is still in the thinking of the Office of Education -- is that most of these programs are designed almost as seed money programs, and not as permanent commitments, which we tend to overlook.

So you get down, in NDSL, to the hard core of people who have to be helped with this kind of loan, and then a large number of people who do not, and in college work study I think we are finding, at least in an urban university like Wayne, that it does encourage (perhaps as time goes on the question Jim asked will be answered) the faculty to arrange its budget so as to add to the three year base from which we started. Certainly I would assume that is still contemplated.

I think we are just like anybody else, and I am sure the worst thing you can say about us is that we are only human in this kind of thing.

DR. MOORE: I think another point may be pertinent here.

As those of you know who have been in and around the financial aid business in the last few years, this whole activity has really come to flower in about the last ten or twelve years. When I went to work in Sacramento in December of 1955, as I recall, there was only one other state scholarship in the whole United States. That was the one in New York that Peter Muirhead was running at that time. Since then I guess 25 or 30 states have developed these things. A whole series of these programs, beginning with NDEA, work study, educational opportunity grants, the new GI bill, and, as Bill said earlier, the extension of Social Security benefits, have all come along, one right after the other. No one of them is really designed to do the whole job. However, if one sits down now and looks just two or three years ahead and begins to project each program just on a modest basis, and then add up the total requirement for all of these, the figure gets pretty staggering rather quickly.

Right now there are hard at work in HEW at least three separate task forces, all trying to figure out what the cost of these financial aid programs should be in 1972 versus what the requirement will be, and beyond that how much of it appropriately belongs in the Federal sector, how much should come from institutions, states, etc., because there is a great big mix of programs. They have all sort of generated like Topsy, and there really is no rational pattern.



I think certainly in the next three or four years, the profession -- you people as well who are in student personnel work -- are all going to have to come to some more sophisticated decisions than we have thus far as to what the best way is to support these kids.

Right now you can get a lot of argument that the best thing to do is just give all the money to the college and let them run the flexible mission, and this is the best way. Well, maybe it is, but the requirement from a money standpoint -- which has been estimated at all the way from \$2- or \$3-billion to \$4- or \$5-billion in 1971, 1972 -- is such that a whole set of pretty hard decisions is going to have to be run through, not only at the Federal level, but in a number of other places, before we finally get down to a rational funding pattern.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Back to the seeding thing, in Michigan -- aside from always having a Governor who is of the opposite party from the legislature, which causes trouble at appropriation time -- we do have programs that are relatively parallel to the Federal program, and I think well conceived and certainly are beginning to have some support from the legislature, so that we have a competitive scholarship program, we have a guaranteed loan program, and an incentive award program, which would be roughly equivalent to the EOG. Nobody knows whether the legislature passed it or not. The lobbyists cannot find out for sure. Apparently they are saving it for next year's election.

What words of wisdom do you have for states like Michigan which have approximately parallel programs to yours? You expect yours to be phased out within the state, I should think.

DR. MOORE: No, I would look at it the other way around. I would hope -- although I am not sure this is the way it will happen -- that you continue to get a larger State investment in this area, and that it is the Federal activity which eventually begins to dissipate in some areas. I think all of us would welcome the day when this whole guaranteed loan business is almost entirely a state operation and the Office of Education is clear out of the picture.

However, anyone who looks at the whole matter of Federal-State relationships knows there are lots and lots of problems in this area, and in some respects, quite apart from student aid, as we have seen in the last 10 or 15 years, there has been a real decided move on the part of states out of the picture, leaving a vacuum which the Federal establishment had to come and fill up.

If the Federal activity is kept at a kind of predetermined level, then you almost force the states into carrying the expansion. If the Federal activity is kept on a level and kept on a narrow basis, states are required, if they want to do something like the California tuition program (which equalizes costs to the student between public and private institutions) then you leave to the state the job of deciding if it wants to do this kind of thing internally, and doing it. But at least I do not see any clear-cut line as to ultimately what will really happen.

DEAN GEORGE H. WATSON (Roosevelt University, Chicago): One of the problems here is the highly variable fiscal capacity in the states. Is there any serious thinking being done about the extent to which the Federal program should be made flexible? So that the sharing with the states would not be to great disadvantage of students and states with low per capita incomes?

DR. MOORE: Yes, I certainly think this is part of it. My own view is that in the next twenty years, or perhaps even less than that, in the next fifteen years, we are going to see a pattern of financing higher education in this country that is unlike anything we have now. I do not know who the genius is who is going to design this and sell it to fifty legislatures and Governors, and to the Congress, but I am certain that it has to come.

This notion of a flexible support pattern, where you have a factor for local effort, could well be a part of it. In many respects this financial aid operation is sort of a stop-gap measure as far as meeting educational costs are concerned, until we find a more comprehensive and rational pattern which can be picked up and used for the next two or three centuries, or whatever.

DEAN SMILEY: At one time there was some talk about the possibility of some sort of administrative over-ride to help pay the costs of reports, and all of this other thing that goes with the Federal programs. Is there any more talk of that nature?

DR. MOORE: There is more than talk. We have administrative over-rides in two programs in place now. In work study an institution may pay up to five percent of the total amount that it spends on off-campus projects during the year to itself for administrative purposes. In NDEA last November the law was modified to allow the institution to charge against the fund an amount equal to one percent of the total outstanding set of loans, if you will, at the end of each year, or half the reasonable cost, whichever is lesser.

One percent of the total amount outstanding is not all the money in the world, except that next year it will be \$10-million for institutions to use, and \$10-million is a pretty sizable amount of money, even distributed among the schools to be used to administer the NDEA program.

DEAN SMILEY: I never did see any implementation of this to show how it was going to be done.

DR. MOORE: That is right. We still have to write this one, and it becomes operative only for the year that ends next week, for the first time.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Your business office will figure out awfully fast how to do it.

DEAN SMILEY: They come to me and ask me.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Ours doesn't. They come and tell us.

Another suggestion has been made in this area, that because of the kinds of Federal programs that now exist of all types -- the GI bill, the Selective Service reporting, which is a government program, National Defense, college work study, EOG, the odds and ends of research enterprises in which we engage, and so on --

DEAN SMILEY: Social Security.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Social Security -- this ought to be covered by a flat administrative fee. This afternoon it was suggested that perhaps \$1,000 per student per year would be a reasonable administrative charge. (Laughter)

DR. MOORE: That is half the budget. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Well, there were not many people around to hear us and commit us to institutions, when we got that far.

DEAN SWENSON: I would like to say with regard to the work study program that on our own campus it had a dramatic impact, and I think one of the reasons for this is that we have seen an increase in faculty-student contact at a level which is a very important one. I think it has helped very much for the student to be able to relate some practical experience to the things that he is studying. I think also it has given the student an opportunity to observe the faculty members in a different setting, and

vice versa. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the program has been received as well as it has.

I think that not only is this true, but it has also brought more attention to the general area of student affairs and financial need so that the result on our campus is going to be a restructuring of the whole student services enterprise. I am very pleased with the work study program and what it has contributed to this.

I wondered whether you had feed-back from other institutions in this regard?

DR. MOORE: Yes, we have had a lot of very excellent comment this last year. Much of it was along the lines you suggest, from students in big institutions who are poor kids and who suddenly found themselves part of the operating business in the University. One boy wrote in and said, "I have a special desk over in the corner of this office, and I am only up there every afternoon from one o'clock until three," or something like that. I have forgotten what he did. But he said, "This gave me a totally different perspective toward this institution. I was thinking of leaving, but now I think I will stay because they obviously are interested enough in me as a person to have me help them run the university."

This was one of our schools toward the east of us here, with an enrollment on campus of 25,000 to 27,000 students, or something like that.

There has been a lot of this. Faculty people who for years could not get research done, or other projects finished because there was no money in the budget to hire people for this particular thing, are now able to do it.

One project -- we have three or four big ones that are going this summer that have been developed pretty much on the basis of local initiative. Our leader in the Midwest is the Arkansas plan, which involves all of the colleges in Arkansas, and a whole network of job assignments which keep the students working in their home communities for the summer.

New York City has created one, although they have kind of hidden the Federal involvement. They call it the Urban Corps. It is a set of arrangements between some 60-odd colleges and the City Civil Service in New York based on pretty much the summer internship idea. Of course, I am quite certain that the City Civil Service is looking at this as a prime source of recruiting Junior Professionals after these kids

have finished school, which I think is all to the good because, as we all know, the public service sector is certainly the one area that is, or is going to expand, if it has not already, on tomorrow's job market.

The only limiting factors on this program, aside from limits on the amount of support that Congress can put into it, is the ingenuity and imagination in the institution itself.

There are numbers of schools that still have most of these kids out washing walls and hashing. This is about it. The more intelligent ones move books around the library. But this is all that the program consists of.

In other institutions where obviously a good deal of thought and planning has gone into it, a very sophisticated pattern of jobs, a whole structure of wage scales, a way where a student can work from one skill, if you will, up to another one, during two or three years in the institution, is a vital adjunct to the educational program and one which (as you point out) helps the student pay his bills next fall without having to carry the loan around.

This is a prime example of providing opportunity for institutions, and then just backing off to see what happens in the schools, and all kinds of things go on.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Just as a matter of curiosity for my own satisfaction, do you emphasize in your faculty the need to supervise these youngsters adequately?

DEAN SWENSON (University of California, San Francisco): With regard to all of our employment, it operates under the same rules as it would with regard to any other employment on the campus. The job has to be classified, the same as any other position. The hiring is done in the same manner. The same type of supervision is necessary.

DEAN NOBLE B. HENDRIX (Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minnesota): I want to go back to the guaranteed loan. Many of us are really troubled about this matter, and I wanted to ask one question with regard to the freedom of the banker to secure what information he wishes, and this may be different from banker to banker. Could you give us a little bit on this, as to whether there is anything in the program that restricts or compels the banker who is involved to limit his information to certain items? Or is he free to ask anything he wants to determine whether or not his bank will make the loan?

DR. MOORE: The pattern of information which the banker is to receive, insofar as application of these interest subsidy benefits is concerned, will be standardized because the same form that comes in to the bank ultimately winds up in our famous computer in Washington.

Beyond that, the information which the lender requires of the student, or which the state guarantee agency may require of the student, I think is pretty much the banker's own business, as long as what he is doing is not in conflict with some aspect of the law. So I think you are probably right. This may be different from bank to bank.

DEAN HENDRIX: Is he free to ask the college for a great deal of other information, other than that on your official form that you are talking about?

DR. MOORE: Well, he only needs the three items of information. You mean, such things as "is this student really in good standing?" "Is he a nice boy?" "Does he behave properly?" This kind of thing? I suppose he could ask you. I do not think you have to give it to him, because he needs to know only your cost, what other aid you have given the student, and a statement that the student is in fact enrolled, which makes him eligible. Beyond that, it seems to me this is a matter between banker and student.

Since the loan is guaranteed you do not have the same kind of credit checks that are ordinarily necessary. However, as I said before, the law is quite open in so far as what the banker may do in the conduct of his own business.

DEAN MOORE (Arkansas State College): Jim, in the light of the Federal seeding money going into guaranteed programs, am I right in assuming that this eliminates this as a source of matching money for EOG grants?

DR. MOORE: The seed money, you mean?

DEAN MOORE: Well, when Federal seed money goes into, let us say, USA, and that is a guaranteed loan with partial seed money, then this cannot be used as matching money for an Educational Opportunity grant?

DR. MOORE: That is right. But the reason, at the moment at least, that guaranteed loans cannot be used as the matching component on grants is that the definition of student financial aid -- because that is what the law talks about, or other aid provided the student by the institution -- only includes

loans in which the institution participates, like NDEA, or like the regular USA loans where you put the deposit money up. Where the loan is financed entirely from non-institutional funds then it has been excluded from the definition of student aid.

However, this is a question that I am quite sure is going to be brought up in front of the Congress next spring because there is an awful lot of argument, especially in states where a lot of public funds go in to a direct loan program; and there is a certain point there, I must admit, in arguing that this ought to be properly brought in under the definition, and then used as matching money. But as the matter now stands, guaranteed loans, unless you guarantee them directly, are outside of that definition.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Bob Goodridge wishes to make a comment.

DR. GOODRIDGE: I just want to say that I do not know what I am doing here when you have a man from Washington like Jim Moore. But I am pleased to be here. This is my ninth NASPA Conference; however, it is the first time I have attended a Conference where I have not been representing an institution.

I will be here Monday and Tuesday, so if you have any questions that I can field for you, please seek me out. If I cannot find an answer, I will get on the phone and get hold of Jim. He is usually in Washington, but you are lucky to find him sometimes. Nevertheless, I will be here Monday and Tuesday and if I can assist you in any way in answering some of your questions, I will be pleased to do so.

It has been an education to work with the U.S. Office of Education. I have been with them for only one year now. I am really impressed with the type of people we have in the Office in Washington. Jim is an excellent representative of this group. They are conscientious, sincere, and willing to do whatever they can to help you get this program going. Believe me, their job is not easy. They have to find answers to questions that have not even been asked. It is really a difficult task but they are doing a real fine job, I think, and are out to help you in any way they can.

Let me say I am here representing Dr. Howard Kreitzer, who is Regional Representative for Region 9 Office, which is in San Francisco, and in the Region 9 office we have another field representative, Mr. James Hoffer. We also have a facilities man. There are other divisions, of course, in the U. S. Office of

Education, but we are also under an expansion or decentralization program, they tell us, from Washington, so that you will have more services in your regional offices, eventually, than you do at the present time. However, the regional offices are always pleased to help you when they can. If they cannot give answers, they usually go to Washington.

Again, Bill, thank you. It was nice being here.

CHAIRMAN KNAPP: Well, Bob, since Sister is here, I will put it in this context. We are always glad to welcome back a fallen-away Dean. (Laughter) Since you have set your own penance of answering any questions these people may have in the next couple of days, I think you may consider that your excommunication is ended. (Laughter)

I think you can see why it was appropriate to tell the Agnes Ellen Harris story about Jim. Jim really -- if anybody does -- knows what is going on in Washington about the financial aid problems which are of direct concern to us in student personnel work. I just wish we could get him to Dean some time, although he might not like it.

One reason that Bob can never get him on the phone, of course, is that 1200 institutions across the country always have him on the phone, and you have to wait your turn to get on. I think you have your evidence tonight as to why that is so.

We do thank you for coming out tonight, Jim. Sorry you will not get a vacation, as the rest of us are doing. He is flying back to Washington at midnight tonight so as to be there for that meeting tomorrow morning.

Thanks once again, Jim and Bob.

DR. MOORE: It is a pleasure to be here.  
(Applause)

... The seminar adjourned at ten o'clock ...



GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION B  
Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966

"Considerations Concerning  
Professional Preparation of  
Student Personnel Administrators"

General Information Session B, meeting in the Williamsburg Room, convened at eight-thirty o'clock, Dean Robert Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University of Ohio, presiding.

CHAIRMAN ETHERIDGE: This is much like a church session, isn't it? All of the bashful people are in the rear, hoping for the nearest exit to the promised land. (Laughter)

The topic for this evening is, "Considerations Concerning Professional Preparation of Student Personnel Administrators." It does not come from any particular text. I have no illustrative point to start this thing going.

I am Bob Etheridge, Miami University of Ohio, and I always have to stick the Ohio in there because someone may make the natural mistake of confusing us with the institution that is located in Coral Gables, Florida. The state still belonged to a foreign land when Miami had its birth.

Just to clear that, and to get on with the program this evening, I might say these General Information Sessions on Sunday night -- that is tonight, and I have lost all track of time, having wandered out Washington way with the family in a tent, taking two weeks to traverse some 4200 miles, and I am not sure I even remember where Ohio is, and further, I am not even sure that I remember what it was that we were going to be talking about tonight. So, to assist the poor presiding officer, what we are after tonight is information gathering.

As you know, the divisions of NASPA are divided into four parts: Personnel services, professional relations and legislation, research and publications, and professional development and standards.

There has been some outstanding work in some of the divisions; there has been some notable progress in others; and we in our own particular division have been very fortunate to have, on the eve of this Conference, one of the publications that stem from our division, the Inservice Education for College Student Personnel.

One of the authors, and in fact the main driving force behind the publication -- in fact, the main driving force -- is with us this evening, John Truitt, who is one of the members of the panel here. I point to this with a great deal of pride, because it represents the first bulletin of NASPA, as well as being an outgrowth of the activities of this particular division.

It is rather difficult to be of service to the membership of NASPA if you really do not know the direction you would like us to go. It is difficult to really ascertain what the controversies within the field of training and development are unless those who are actually involved in it tell us what they are, because each of us brings to it our own biases, our own campus references, and our own difficulties.

So what we would like to do tonight, hopefully, is to involve you, along with the panel, in trying to arrive at some directions that we should take in this whole area of preparation of student personnel administrators.

By way of review, there have been many documents in the last two years that have come out that attempt to get at this problem. Probably the one with which you are most familiar, because it has received the widest distribution, is the COSPA publication, a Proposal for Professional Preparation for Student Personnel Work. This was a joint effort of the eight associations who met in three working sessions and finally worked out this document over a period of a year and a half. It is something that has met with a great deal of discussion and something that has met with a considerable amount of disagreement. But I think it has done one thing: It stimulated us toward thinking about what constitutes the formal elements of a training program to get one ready for this profession we call student personnel work.]

It was a chore that I think was remarkable in the fact that these eight associations were willing to sign their names to it. That is as much a remarkable achievement as the contents.

[ This promoted some discussion within APGA, and an inter-divisional committee was formulated at the request of the president, Esther Lloyd-Jones and others worked on a statement which was entitled, "The Role and Preparation of Counselors and Other Student Personnel Workers in Institutions of Higher Learning." ]

As one can see, this placed an emphasis on counseling as an entry point into preparation in this

area. [ACPA, which was one of the participating Associations in the preparation of the original COSPA document, came out with their document called "The Function and Preparation of College Student Personnel Workers." ]

The three documents, put together, rather formed the basis of what it is we are talking about as we prepare individuals, graduate students, older persons who have had successful teaching careers or advising with students, who have been called upon to get into the field. What is our responsibility to them, and so on?

Don Robinson is with us this evening. At the last APGA meeting he was called upon to analyze the three statements relative to the preparation of college student personnel workers. This came forth in this document.

In another area, we have with us Dr. Jane Matson, who has been as active as anyone else, and is one of the leading experts in the whole phenomenon of Junior College activity and specifically Junior College student personnel programs. She was with us at the COSPA meeting in Chicago -- the one before last -- and has been active along with Max Raines who, in a recent Junior College Journal article, came out with the report of the two-year study by the National Committee for Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs.

The Program Chairman, Tom Emmet, with considerable foresight in knowing of our Junior College Constitutional Revision, seemed to think it was appropriate to bring in an analysis of training programs for Junior College activity. Certainly it is a very vital force in the education of the youth of America, and I think it deserves equal attention with that of training for workers in four-year and multiple year institutions.

We have another "visiting fireman," to the point that he wrote a dissertation, and, you know, these days that is no small activity, with the press of having to earn a living and other things. Jim Rhatigan, who is with us from Wichita State, under the guidance of Don Hoyt, wrote a dissertation entitled "Professional Preparation of Student Personnel Administrators, as Perceived by Practitioners and Faculty Trainers." So we have that expert with us.

Dean Stanley Benz is just a good, loyal worker, along with me, who is busy trying to earn a living as a Dean of Students but who, in earlier days, has

had much interest in the realm of inservice education. So that is how we got to where we are, with perhaps the exception of a document that was written in Washington, which Don Robinson probably will be able to tell us more about.

ACPA, ACES, and SPATE got together and tried to prepare a joint paper entitled, "The Role and Preparation of Student Personnel Workers in Institutions of Higher Learning."

To the best of my knowledge, Max's short article in the Junior College Journal, and the COSPA document represent the only ones that have received any kind of general distribution. So if you have not been trying to read them and to keep up with them, perhaps you are not as confused as those of us who have been trying to read them and trying to figure out just where we do fit.

It is my own humble opinion that we apparently solicited every point of view except probably the most important one, and that is, what does the President of a University think makes a good Dean, not only in terms of job performance, but also in terms of how does he get the training to be one. Perhaps that is the next task we should undertake.

With that as a confusing background, and an array of papers that you could not have read because I do not think they are generally available, we are going to try to enter into some discussion this evening that hopefully will be helpful to Stan, Don, and John, and Jack Sorrells, who is not with us this evening, to try to work on within the Division of Professional Development and Standards, that we can in turn give back to you in a form such as this, what we would consider to be important aspects of professional development.

As you can imagine, spring being what it is, we have not had a lot of time to get together. After all, Southern Illinois, Central California, Southern California, Indiana, and Wichita are reasonably widely separated. Since the Chairman has the malady of all Deans (he does not like to write and put things in writing), we have come here reasonably confused and disorganized.

Jim Rhatigan really does not know that he is going to be asked to say a few words about what he found out in his dissertation, and Jane Matson probably is aware that she is here for some reason, and she is going to be called upon to say a few words about what she perceives to be some of the problems of training in the Junior College area.

I do not want it to be long; neither do I want it to be too short. But when we take the training point of view from a practitioner, and the training point of view from a trainer, we hope that with another trainer on the left here, in that Don is at Southern Illinois -- with three practitioners here and a whole host of you out there -- we will come up with a discussion that hopefully will extend on to ten o'clock and beyond.

So may I call on Jim Rhatigan who is going to present some of the either encouraging or discouraging experiences he found when he went to the task of circulating questions to trainers and administrators about the whole task of preparation (for lack of a better term at this point) of Deans. Jim.

DEAN JAMES RHATIGAN (Dean of Students, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas): I anticipated that you would do something like this, so I have made some notes on this dissertation that I wrote recently.

First, I want to put in my own word of congratulations to the people in ACPA and COSPA, and Bob for what I think, after looking at this in some detail, is a very complex question.

Really before I get started I want to indicate some of the complexities in order to form the kind of background for the discussion that I am sure will follow, in that this is an opinion-oriented subject -- at least as it appears in the literature. Let me just briefly describe some of the complexities that the people have faced who have been trying to discuss the issue of professional preparation.

First of all, there is the still unresolved question as to whether or not we are a profession. If you have read W. H. Cowley and Wrenn on this subject, they are still not convinced. As recently as the last APGA meeting -- Bob and I attended one session where Gilbert Wrenn described this as an umbrella of vocations. So to talk of professional preparation for the Financial Aids Director, the Union Director, and the Dean of Students in one breath, in itself may be a very difficult problem.

There is also the question of the differences in the types and sizes of institutions to be served -- the small Liberal Arts College, for example, as opposed to the large, urban university; and the kinds of problems that the Student Personnel Administrators are likely to experience in those different kinds of schools. The functions that are performed at Miami of Ohio, and the University of California at Berkeley also

might be quite different, in terms of the different kinds of knowledge and skill that might be required. Also, the professional trainers themselves have been faced with the problem of training people who have different vocational aspirations. Some definitely want to go into this work, and others are undecided, and think of student personnel work in its generic term and nothing more.

In one program Professor Robinson here would face a student who was in the Master's degree program and perhaps one in the specialist's program, and one in the doctorate program, and he would have to prescribe a curriculum for each of these.

There is also a real serious criterion problem in determining what we mean by, or how would we establish what a successful student personnel program would be like, and how would we measure the effectiveness of our project.

Also, in viewing this as a single criterion, you find that the Dean of Students might be very effective in one phase of his job, counseling, for example, and seriously deficient in other phases of his job such as supervision of staff.

So the criterion problem for those who want to evaluate the effectiveness of programs is a difficult one. Also the determination as to how effective a Student Personnel Administrator is would vary with the evaluator; whether or not he might be a professor or university president, as Bob suggested, or a student who had contact with his dean, or parents, might affect the determination of whether the dean was very good or very poor.

There is also a positive course work that really is exclusive for student personnel administration. It has been stated by some that we have resorted to what has been called "unadapted borrowings from other disciplines." To the extent this is true, a course in counseling in one institution might be quite different than a course with the same title in another institution.

There are also biases in the training institution itself and of the faculty personnel workers in that institution. You would find at the two extremes, I think, a group who perceive counseling as the best entree to understanding the college student, and to his effectiveness as a personnel worker.

In the last few years there has been a growing movement to educate people in our profession in a

course of study which has been described as higher education to view the student through the ideological factors associated with his institution, rather than from a psychological standpoint.

Add to these complexities the compounding factors of the personal characteristics and values, and previous academic factors of the students who come to these training programs, and it would suggest that a lot of flexibility is going to have to characterize our training programs, and we may find that we have to tailor make our programs around the individuals.

In the little study I did, I found the most condemning writing on the subject to be in Berg Wolf, and they rather grimly stated that there has been no piece of literature in our journals to indicate that any student personnel worker, through research reported, has profited from the training; that he might have been just as effective had he not had this training.

In addition, we have 200 institutions that are now offering courses in student personnel work. I doubt that even all of these are known to our national student personnel organizations. Also, of these 27 offer the doctorate, which was the group which I used for the study which I will describe briefly.

Before I get into what I have tried to do, I was struck in the review of the literature on this subject by a comment by a man named Gordon Hullfish, who belonged to this organization in 1941, in which he noted that to many deans they were of the opinion that a good dean was born and not made, and training in it was superfluous. I think there is a vestige of this feeling which still remains.

By way of review, I think you can see, if you have not already thought about this many times before, that this is a very complex question, and this is why a lot of people spend a great deal of time in trying to tackle the problem in the best way that they know how, and that way is pretty much on logical grounds, and with no available evidence.

The study I did was generated from the frequent observation that training programs do not reflect the realities of facts. I thought if I could survey a group of deans and a group of people who are in charge of training programs that I might be able to at least establish at which point agreement and disagreement occurred to which future attention on this subject could be directed.

For this reason I was restricted in the kind of dean I could call on, because of the diversity of

institutions which I described earlier. So I decided to send a questionnaire to deans of large institutions which I defined at 5,000 or more, and to every faculty trainer, one principal faculty trainer from each of the institutions in the country that offered the doctorate in student personnel in higher education, or counseling psychology.

Now, there are 170 deans of the kind I described. Hereafter we will stay away from the design of my study. For any skeptics in the audience, I will be glad to show the little machinations I went through later.

In broad-brush fashion, I wanted to say one more thing about the instrument I used. I thought it was very relevant in that the COSPA document had just come out, so I took almost every training recommendation from that COSPA document and included it in my questionnaire, feeling that here would be the most up-to-date thinking of a group of professionals from all phases of personnel work, and as relevant as any that I could find.

On logical grounds, as I say, it looks to be like real good data. What I thought I would find, you see, is that the faculty trainers would probably have different points of emphasis that they would like to prescribe for training programs than a group of practitioners.

But what I really found was that there was widespread disagreement between the two groups. The trainers do not agree among themselves as to how student personnel workers should be trained. Even more so, student personnel workers in the field do not agree among themselves as to how student personnel workers should be trained.

Of the 17 training recommendations which I selected from the COSPA report there were only 6 categories on which one or both groups reached a consensus that this would be a good item for the preparation of a student personnel worker.

On all 17 items they agreed that some training would be desirable, but I am talking now mostly about consensus, for example, that basic psychological principles would be desirable training for a student personnel worker. But for the faculty trainers, for example, I got almost a rectangular distribution as to how much training in basic psychological principles, this learning through perception motivation, and things like this that an effective Dean of Students would need.



As I say, 21 percent say less than 5 percent of the graduate program; 29 percent say 15 percent or more of the graduate program, with similar distributions in the middle two categories.

I did a little simple statistical analysis on all this and found no differences because I had no agreement within the groups, which could not in any way be designed as consensus as to how the personnel worker should be trained.

But on the six training recommendations, in which there was consensus, I tell you briefly that I determined consensus to be two-thirds of the respondents. The only agreement which I got was as follows:

That a student personnel worker should have at least six semester hours of appraisal (this would be testing and other appraisal devices), 9 hours of counseling and practicum. Actually I determined six hours of practicum and only three hours of counseling background. I suppose it would have to be called introduction to counseling, or something like this. And 12 to 14 hours of social, cultural influences on development, which really is outside of our own area.

Then everyone seemed to feel that the prospective dean should have some course work in the basic educational principles, such as curriculum construction, and so forth. This is in contrast to the ACPA document, for example, which tells us that students should have a continuous exposure to systematic philosophy, the social sciences, the biological natural sciences, the humanities, and the continuing attempt to relate these fields to practice.

I would say that this reflects the kind of problem we had in discussing the question of professional preparation in that we have no data -- at least none in print -- that we know of to guide us in thinking of how a professional personnel worker should be trained. The little consensus I just related to you does not add up to a year of graduate study. Now, we do not want to demonstrate the desirability of diversity in our training programs. We are not yet a medical or a legal profession, and we need not be completely concerned with an inflexible curriculum, but I think what Mr. Etheridge and the COSPA people and the ACPA people are trying to do is to develop a common core by which the profession can be tied together.

Now, it is tempting to suggest, in terms of what I found, that one useful way of approaching this would be -- this is not a logical transgression from my remarks, but later I discussed the benefits to be

derived from a more aggressive and substantive program of internships in student personnel work. I have seen a letter to Mr. Etheridge where the dean was asked to comment on this and urged us to give considerable course credit for internship experiences.

I would agree, it is probably worth it, except that I think this would lend more weight to some of the critics of the profession who believe that we have a watered down curriculum, and this would actually make matters worse. I refer here to Mark Smith's 1959 study of how faculty members perceived us, and this is the way they perceived us, as not having a good, theoretical foundation. I think, if nothing else, we need to cover that gap more than anything else.

I also think that it would be desirable for the professional organizations to evaluate the current training programs in the field. A systematic attempt to do this would really require more consensus within your professional organizations, I think, and it should really be a cooperative effort rather than any kind of a coercive or threatening kind of thing to interrupt the work which the fine people who are in professional preparation are trying to do.

Well, this is pretty much the background. There was a lot more in what I did, but I think that is most relevant to this meeting.

CHAIRMAN ETHERIDGE: Thank you, Jim. I think you can see from what he found that maybe there was some basis for our confusion, most of which resulted from armchair theorizing, rather than good, sound research activity, and I think it points up the necessity for continued research in what this profession is all about; if indeed, as Jim posed in his opening question, is this a profession, or do we just call it that?

I would ask you to be prepared for Glen Nygreen's presentation in his presidential address, in which he raises essentially the same question. There are some people who have been reading it, and going around to various meetings to be all primed as reactors to Glen's remarks. For those of you who went to the APGA meeting in Washington and heard Ralph Burney raise essentially the same questions, I think you can see it is a matter of continuing concern.

Our keynote address tonight indicated that perhaps we are much too preoccupied with trying to designate ourselves as professionals than we are in trying to do the job at hand.

I wanted to add a postscript to our pioneering document here -- John's document -- to indicate

that there is an appendix to it, prepared by Tom Emmet, which is a guide to programs of training for college and university student services and personnel workers, which comes out under the June '66 date.

As I understand it, those of you who are members should have this on your desk at home when you return, if other things have worked right. Since some of you have been gone for two weeks, maybe you already have it. I do not know.

Jane Matson, I suspect, is going to answer some of these doubts, or if she does not she will offer some thoughts of her own that she has arrived at in working with a whole, really, new and exciting concept in public education today, and that is the Junior College. It is not new. I suspect it is well over a half century old at this point. But still, in terms of higher education, it is a distinct American phenomenon, and the Junior College represents a kind of a new, big, bouncing baby with strength in its own right. There are students there, and there are problems there, and there is a need for people there to deal with students and their problems.

Jane, could you talk to us a little bit about that?

DR. JANE MATSON (Professor of Education, Los Angeles State College, Los Angeles, California): After listening to what has been said here this evening, I wonder if I have the same kind of reaction that perhaps some of you do, and that is kind of utter confusion.

I would like to sort out for myself, and perhaps we can have some interchange later on and communication with you as to your reactions as to some of these things, and I think we are facing some problems here.

I am going to talk first of all about student personnel preparation in general, and then say something specifically about the problems in the Junior College picture, since that is the reason for my being here.

I am somewhat tempted to say it does not make any difference what we do because we are never going to have enough student personnel workers, professionally trained or otherwise, so why worry about it, and let's stop trying to dream up programs of preparation.

「About a year or so ago someone in the U. S. Office took a slide rule and tried to make some predictions about the shortages in the area of student personnel workers in higher education by 1972. He came up with the figure 123,000 short.」 This, in itself, was

enough to make me feel, oh well, what's the use? If we are going to be that short, it won't make much difference what we do in the next ten years.

That was in one of my more discouraged moments and I do not feel that way most of the time. But I do feel this is an issue -- and I was going to say criticism, but that is not really what it is. The comment was made that we really do not know whether professional training makes any difference or not. Maybe we can take people without professional training and put them in student personnel jobs, and maybe they will work out as well or better. We have been proving this for a long time, because I would venture to suggest that a great many people in student personnel work today are there with very little of what I would call professional training. Consequently, we have already demonstrated that you can get by without it.

I think the question we need to address ourselves to is what is the best of all possible worlds, and hopefully we can make some gestures or movements in that direction.

As a general comment I would like to make, I would hope also that we would not rely only on what is now being done in the field -- that is, make a survey of present practices in student personnel work, and then design training preparation programs around that, because I am not convinced we are doing student personnel work as well as it should be done, and maybe one of the reasons we are not is that we have not properly prepared people to do the job as it needs to be done.

So I think if we just stop short with simply finding out what is going on and then prepare people to do that, I think this is perhaps one of the reasons that Mr. Rhatigan found some of the differences and disagreements between the two groups that he did in his most interesting study.

If we talk about professional preparation, I think we have to separate the pre-service end, in-service, or both-service, because I think these are two quite different problems, and require some different kinds of approaches.

I am a little bit concerned about trying to devise programs of preparation that will specifically prepare a person to enter a certain field in student personnel and in a certain kind of institution, because the students that I see frequently are not at all sure exactly what area of student personnel work they want to get into, and they will take whatever entry job

comes along that seems to lead them into the right direction, and they may end up in any one of a number of fields and their training has not been specifically directed toward financial aid or housing or activities, or what have you. I think it would be unfortunate if we tried to put them into somewhat watertight compartments and prepare them specifically for these jobs, because I do not think this is the way to do it.

I think we have to speak and think in terms of broad general background. The same thing is true in terms of institutional settings in which people are going to work. I would heartily agree that the kind of student personnel work that goes on in the very small liberal arts college, or the very large university and the junior college -- I have mentioned only three rather different kinds of institutions -- the student personnel work differs considerably.

On the other hand, a young person starting training probably does not know which one he is headed for. Here again I think we are obligated in preparation to give as broad a background and as general a background, without making it so watered down or so broadly general that it is of no value.

I suppose one of the reasons we have confusion in this field is that we really do not know enough, or we have not defined the job of student personnel. I think this was what we found as far as the Carnegie study was concerned. I am not going to refer to that too much because Max Raines is going to come tomorrow and he and I are going to talk about this study tomorrow.

The first thing we discovered, of course, was that we could not use the term "student personnel" because it did not mean the same thing in various institutions. What was student personnel in one was not student personnel in another institution. We had to get down to functions and talking about very specific functions, and do our own categorizing and not leave it up to the institution to define student personnel work.

I think this is a real problem, and one of the reasons we get so confused in talking about problems of preparation, because the general goals and objectives of student personnel work, and the functions through which these goals and objectives supposedly are materialized have not been well enough defined by the profession so that we can talk about training programs and have any degree of general agreement. This, I think, needs to be done.

Another issue that we face, which was somewhat vaguely referred to here this evening, is this counseling that keeps coming up all the time. I come from a counselor education background. I think here again we get involved in semantics, because counseling means one thing to one person, or one group, and something else to another group. We talk about, "Well, we do not want counseling," or "We do want it," and it seems to me this has to be faced up to, and I think probably counseling is going to have to be more broadly defined perhaps, as it has been in the secondary school setting. Counseling in the secondary school setting really means student personnel work in higher education. I think here is where we get involved in the confusion. At least, it does in California, and I can only speak with any degree of authority as we find in California it represents all of the guidance services, just as student personnel work represents all of the guidance services. This is an area that we are going to have to face up to, and come to some kind of resolution, I think, of this bugaboo that seems to rear its head constantly in these kinds of discussions where one person says, "We don't want counseling," and another person says, "Well, we do want counseling as a focal point," and so on.

Then there is this business of where is the student personnel program -- if we were ever to get agreement as to what it was to be -- where is it to be housed, in the whole area of higher education or professional preparation?

There are, of course, many possibilities. There is the possibility of putting it in a higher education department, where it is now situated in some institutions, although, in the study that I did of the training resources, it did not take me very long to exhaust the resources of the preparation of student personnel workers in higher education. I wrote to some 90 institutions and I would get back replies, "Well, we have not offered this course. We are listed as having offered this as an option. We have not offered it for about five years now. This is kind of vague. If anybody comes along who wants to go into student personnel work we will devise a program for him, but we have not had any recently."

This is the kind of approach, and there is no real, organized kind of a program at all, in any fashion. I think this is a characteristic of the programs of student personnel work preparation, I am sorry to say.

Then, of course, there are the counselor-education programs, the guidance departments, or

whatever you will call it. They are called a number of things. This is another area where they might be situated. Still another area, of course, is the counseling psychology, which is certainly related here, but perhaps it is too specific but it is mentioned frequently.

These are some of the practical problems you run into when you try to devise a program. I have not even tried to talk about selection of students, which I think probably is one of the most important ones that faces us and is related to our problems here. We do not really know what constitutes a good student personnel worker, so it is pretty hard to select good graduate students to enter the program with any degree of confidence that they will be successful when they complete the program. This selection and retention is an area that is of great concern to me personally.

Then there is this whole problem of practicum supervision. I find frequent reference to, "Well, what we really need is more practicum and more internship, and this kind of thing."

I would heartily agree, except that a practicum and an internship, to be really effective, has to have very effective supervision, and this is what we do not have, it seems to me. We do not have the resources for that available, and I am sure that you Deans of Students, some of you at least, in your institutions would look with not great favor on setting aside a sizable proportion of your budget to support people who are going to be engaged in supervision of interns, because interns cannot learn without supervision, and he does not learn the right things if he does not have supervision.

I am interested in my own institution in this and at Los Angeles we are hiring a person whose full time job will be to supervise the interns that we have in our program. We have a number of them coming from the vocational rehabilitation program, from my own program in the Junior College, and from other people who are interested in some experience in this field. But this is rare, and I think it is important and something that we have not given sufficient attention to.

Now I would like to say just a word about the Junior College picture. I frequently am asked, "What is different about the Junior College? Why do you have to have any special training to go into the Junior College? Why don't you just have the same kind of training that everybody else has?"

I get this from people who are preparing secondary counselors, and I get it from people who are



preparing four year college workers, and so on. My answer to this is that to the extent that the institution differs, in terms of its philosophy, its goals and objectives, the person who is going to work there needs to know something a little different than if he is going to work in some other kind of institution.

I do not think I make a great plea for having a separate training program. I do not intend to. There are great areas of overlap here, and the general kind of training, preparation and background that I spoke of earlier I think is just as important here. But I think what has been omitted in most programs is any reference to the Junior College. It would be quite possible for a person to go through a doctoral program in student personnel work in higher education -- at least up until very recently -- or he could go through any other kind of a program leading toward secondary guidance, and never hear the word "Junior College" mentioned.

I think this is due, in part at least, to the fact that the people teaching the courses do not know anything about Junior Colleges either, and consequently they do not talk about them. The Junior College, even though it has been around for some time, has only recently made much of an impact on the world of higher education, or post-high school education. People simply are not as informed about the Junior Colleges as they need to be, if they are going to prepare people to work in them. I think this is a problem that we hope to do something about in the next year or so.

Junior College student personnel work is the only area that I know of that has been able to take a real look at itself and do an evaluated study. Fortunately, the American Association of Junior Colleges, through the grant from the Carnegie Corporation, embarked on a two year study which was designed to evaluate, to appraise, and then to lay out plans for development of student personnel programs. This is the only level of education that I know of which has done this in any organized fashion.

The picture we found was not pretty. It was pretty discouraging, as a matter of fact. I do not think it is any more discouraging than the picture would be in four-year institutions, if you were to make the same kind of a study with them. Nevertheless, we do know what the general status of affairs is, as far as student personnel work in the Junior Colleges is concerned, and we are not satisfied with what we found. The Junior College establishment as such is not satisfied with it, and intends to do something about it.



I think this is one of the reasons why we are hearing more about specialized preparation. The Junior Colleges feel that they have so much catching up to do in terms of preparation, and they are making somewhat loud noises about it at the moment.

I would be happy to answer any specific questions. I cannot tell you about any specific plans except the ones that you know about through NDA counseling and guidance institutes, which are starts certainly and not to be overlooked. I am sure many of you have staff members who are participating in NDA counseling and guidance institutes in higher education, one of which is right here at the University of Washington this summer. These are drops in the bucket, so to speak, but they are at least a beginning, and I think one which perhaps can lead to more fruitful work in the future.

CHAIRMAN ETHERIDGE: I see that some people have been making copious notes, and all of you have been very attentive. I am not sure that what we have in mind presents any great potential for fireworks, but I would hope that it would present a potential for involvement.

I am going to call on any member of the platform party here who feels so inclined and moved to comment, if he would choose, on any of the thoughts that have been presented to this point. At the conclusion of that, then I hope we have a merry free-for-all that will involve you all.

I want to say that at the meeting of the Advisory Committee in this division this afternoon, we had a wonderful time. We had six members there, and we came out of it with six points of view, and I think the two presentations that you had this evening indicate that there are about as many points of view as there are institutions and people working in them.

So, rather than to destroy that myth, I would like to call on any member of the panel that wants to comment at this point, and then we will get involved, hopefully, in some dialog that will follow. Anybody want to say anything?

VOICE: The Chairman gave some of us such a lengthy forewarning, but a few things struck my fancy.

Referring to Jim's excellent paper, I think we have a paradox here that is quite interesting, because in the little study that I did, primarily for ACPA, that was done for the inter-divisional committee, a few of us looked at all three, as Bob Etheridge

indicated -- we looked at all three of the statements on preparation prepared by professional organizations that I think we would agree are fairly representative.

One of them was COSPA, which represents 8 or 9, and several members of each of the 8 or 9 organizations were on the committee that contributed to the document.

The ACPA document was prepared completely independently by its Commission 12, which is the Committee on Professional Preparation, which is composed of about fourteen people, nine of whom were quite actively engaged in the preparation of that document.

The APGA Interdivisional Committee report was the work of the Esther Lloyd-Jones Committee and represented the three organizations primarily within APGA, with anyone who thinks they had anything to do with college personnel work.

Well, the interesting thing is that if you take now the documents prepared by these three groups, or at least designated representatives of these three groups, there is a great deal of essential agreement, and if you will accept that these represent the leadership to a certain extent of the groups, this presents kind of a paradox between what people are involved in training and leadership positions, agreement among them, and yet when you get into the vineyards there is disagreement.

In all three of these documents you find the same kind of core running through them. One, there seems to be fairly essential agreement that you cannot do even a minimal job in terms of basic preparation in less than two years. All seem to recognize that a doctoral is desirable, but are realistic enough to understand that we have many positions in the field that are going to be filled with people with less than a doctorate. All agree that a background at the graduate level in the behavioral sciences is quite essential. There is slightly different terminology, but even the course work tends to work out. For my money I would rather have my students take their basic work in the behavioral sciences from the experts in that area, rather than, for example, from myself or another person in our department.

All of these documents represent the necessity of some preparation in, if you will, tool or technique subjects, like counseling. The ACPA document differs from the others, departs from the others in emphasizing the need for research training to a greater extent. The COSPA document emphasizes and bears down a

little more heavily on what I would call the administrative kind of activities.

All seem to recognize the necessity for a fairly good understanding of the institution, the community in which one works -- that is, higher education.

To me, some of the hallmarks of a profession -- again, maybe I am too much the optimist -- are a developing literature, which we have; as I see it, a growing agreement about, at least, basic training, and if you look at some of our older, more prestigious professions, you will find a great deal of dissimilarity of preparation of specialists when you get beyond their agreed-upon basic training. So I am not too concerned that we find considerable differences among our programs.

All of the statements also, of course, recognize the importance of internship, practicums, things of that sort. What Jane said, of course, is essential and involves people like you with people like us. An internship, of course, has to be a meaningful learning experience. It has to be treated as a responsible thing, and with as much supervision as a medical intern is given. That is, he has real responsibility, but it is responsibility with supervision.

Quite candidly, I think because of our need, at times we view the graduate intern simply as another pair of hands pretty much to do the janitorial work around the office.

I have heard off and on today, and in other meetings in the past few months, "Well, we do not even know from what disciplines people should come to the field."

Again, if you look at our older professions, they come from a host of backgrounds. Ours do, and should. I think that if you would consider it, the most important characteristics, it seems to me, are obviously maybe of a non-intellective nature. In our program people come from math backgrounds, they come from psychology, they come from elementary education, they come from sociology, they come from English. One even comes from chemistry in this coming year. But all have certain characteristics. We hope to be looking for intelligence, obviously emotional security, flexibility in outlook, open-mindedness, objectiveness. These seem to me to be some characteristics of student personnel administrators.

Most of the people, it seems to me, who entered the training programs, if they have a common characteristic, it is an interest at an undergraduate level and experience in working with student groups. So I think in general that probably we have more to build on than at first we are willing to recognize. Perhaps we are being a little bit too defensive. Sure we have a long way to go, but I have a hunch that we are a little farther along the road than perhaps at times we want to admit.

CHAIRMAN ETHERIDGE: Thank you.

VOICE: Sometimes I think that we have set very unrealistic goals for ourselves, and we are all trying to state an objective and devise a common means by which we can all achieve that objective. I do not think this is necessary at all, and I think it may be one of the problems that we encounter with this professional preparation.

I think one other thing should be said, too, and that is that there are two distinctive kinds of people involved in this, because there are two distinctive kinds of inservice education or professional preparation.

One of them, of course, is the academic education for the field. Those of us who are interested in the inservice education are interested in the art, primarily, of personnel work. And the people who are interested in teaching this are interested in the science of it.

There is a big gap, I think, between the art and the science of what it takes now to do a job on the college campus. I went through a program where there was not a single person teaching student personnel work who had ever had a day's experience in the job of applying what they were actually teaching.

At the institution I am at at the present time we are getting in the first man next year who ever had a day's work in trying to apply any of the concepts that he has learned in the classroom, out on the job in dealing with people across the desk, and parents, and other kinds of things in student personnel work.

I think basically, in the intern types of programs, whether you give credit for them or whether you do not give credit for them, you get a different kind of responsibility there. You get what I call the responsibility of involvement. I think that is quite a different kind of responsibility. When you hire a person to do a job, then you use inservice education to

help him do a better job in which you have chosen him to do, I call that basically real responsibility, or responsibility for the outcome.

I basically do not think there is going to be too much other than familiarity with the job. He may get the music, so to speak, but he will not get the real outcome or the real sense of responsibility unless he personally, deep down, is charged with that kind of responsibility.

One of the things I would like to say simply is that I think basically that in trying to look for this definite goal, and a definite means to achieve that definite goal, that we are overlooking a very important point. I simply believe that one of the ways in which the professional preparation of personnel workers on our campus, the key to it, I am pretty well convinced is the quality of relationships this person has on the campus, the quality of relationships that he has between himself and professors, himself and other students, himself and academic people, himself and personnel people, himself and administrators, and so forth.

I think it is really basically according to our own unique kind of a program, our own unique kind of structure, our own unique kind of circumstances on our campuses, for us to work out and make possible these kinds of relationships, and to improve the quality of those kinds of relationships, and I think basically the person -- both the person who is being educated and the person doing the education are in a much better position to arrive at some understanding of the complexity of the responsibility which he is trying to become a part of, of a profession of which he is trying to become a part, rather than atomistically try, because I think we need an integrated background that gives this fellow this feel for this business, and not just the sum total of everything he has taken, or every job that he has had on the college campus.

DEAN STANLEY BENZ (Dean of Students, San Jose State College, San Jose, California): I just want to make a comment or two on the direction that it seems to me we are taking in this discussion.

It occurs to me that there are 168 hours in the week, and if the average student, carrying a full load, spends an hour in class and an hour going and an hour coming, or spends that two hours in studying, however you want to put it, that will work out to roughly a 40-hour work week for him, and he still has 128 hours left.

Often when I am asked what is my job as a Dean of Students by a person who is totally unacquainted with it, I try to say that I am concerned about the student when he is outside the class, and the professors are concerned about him when he is inside the class. I am concerned with him when he is inside the class too.

Another way to put it is that the professor perhaps is not as concerned with him when he is outside the classroom. But when the student is outside the classroom, he is concerned with those things which are our responsibility as student personnel workers -- many of the things -- call them chores, if you want to, housing, for example. I do not think we are in the hotel business. There needs to be something other than, in addition to food and shelter in a college housing program. The use of leisure time, and recreation, and social and cultural development, the student's health, and his placement on the job, and counseling in his problems, and student government and activities, all of those things are our concern.

I think that every one of these things should be an educational experience for the student, right down to discipline problems with which we deal. We need to deal with them in such a way that the student will learn by the experience, and all learning is not pleasant. It may be tough for him to learn this lesson because of his involvement in some disciplinary activity.

The big problem, it seems to me -- which has been mentioned by all these folks tonight, and it was mentioned by Glen Nygreen tonight, is what we need to find in a student personnel worker is a person who has an attitude of helpfulness. How do you get that? Some people who are expert scholars -- in Shakespeare, for example, they had an attitude of helpfulness. I know a mathematician on our campus who is very interested in helping people. He likes to help them learn mathematics, primarily, but beyond that he is really interested in people.

I know a chemist who is an excellent chemist but he really likes to help students learn chemistry. He is much more interested in that than he is in sitting in a corner doing research. And I am not against research, but I am talking about the interest in the student which must be displayed by a student personnel worker.

I think really the academic background, the strict academic discipline, is probably irrelevant, but it is the attitude of the person that is most important.

So often when we think of inservice training, or pre-training of a personnel worker, we are thinking in terms of the accumulation of a bagfull of tricks through which we can solve problems, cope with situations, put out fires, and do these things. And we have to do this. The fire department is a real important thing in the city, especially if it is your house that is on fire, and we have to have a fire department, no question about it.

We need to deal with all these problems, but beyond that I think that when I go out to hire someone to be on our personnel staff, I try to find a person who is a warm, cordial, friendly person who wants to help people, who is not too concerned about his salary or about the hours that he works. He just really gets a big kick out of helping a student get what he came to college to get.

So we need people with enthusiasm. The question is, what kind of thing will help a personnel worker to develop the kind of attitude which we may not be able to name, but which we all would like to see our staff members have? How can we help him develop such an attitude? What kinds of courses can he take?

One person this afternoon said, "Give me the individual and then I will tell you what he needs by way of training."

Well, sure, I would quite agree with that. Maybe what he most needs is a course in philosophy, or maybe he needs some practice in counseling; or maybe he needs to know a little bit more about business management, because he is going to help students with financial aid, and there are certain practical limits, the business manager tells me, with regard to financial matters.

I think that a student personnel worker has to have a broad basis -- I almost said smattering -- of information and knowledge in many, many areas, but more important than a depth of knowledge in any one academic discipline, it seems to me is the attitude of helpfulness.

There are two ways to get it, it seems to me, and you can probably name more. There may be some courses that will help the person develop this attitude of service. It may also be precept and example from the people for whom he works that would help him.

CHAIRMAN ETHERIDGE: It is getting close to that hour of termination. I had no idea that we would present to you such a depth of insight from the panel

that we would exhaust the time allotted to us, but that is the way with this work, it is filled so often with pleasant surprises.

Are there any comments that you have from the floor tonight, in terms of what has been said, what you would like to say in the form of a document that you could use in your own work, that you could use to persuade your president or your dean that your qualifications are good, that you are doing a good job, that these are the kinds of experiences that new men we have to have need to have?

Do you have any comments at all that we could chew on at this point?

... Discussion from the floor followed ...

---



GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION C  
Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966

"The American Association of  
University Professors and the  
Association of American Colleges  
Statements on Student Freedoms --  
A Comparison and Discussion of  
Viewpoints"

General Information Session C, meeting in the Spanish Ballroom, convened at eight-thirty o'clock, Rev. Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., Vice President of Student Affairs, Xavier University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN RATTERMAN: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am Father Ratterman, Dean of Students at Xavier University, at Cincinnati, Ohio.

On my right is Dr. Peter Armacost, who is with the Association of American Colleges. Pete, what is the exact position down there?

DR. ARMACOST: Program Director, but don't ask me what that means.

CHAIRMAN RATTERMAN: He says he is Program Director "but don't ask me what that means." (Laughter) I would like to point out that we are listed in the program as resource persons, not as experts. I think this will become evident as the evening goes along.

Our subject this evening is a very interesting one, one that we are all plagued with and fascinated by, "Student Rights and Freedoms."

I guess the first declaration on student rights that hit the American scene was issued by the National Student Association some twenty years ago when they first established the National Student Association. This was one of the first things they did, they issued a declaration of student rights. It was called to their attention at that time that they should not issue a declaration of student rights without a corresponding declaration of student responsibilities. So the following year they issued that.

Subsequently there have been a number of statements which have come out in regard to student rights. We will be discussing these in the course of the evening, so I just want to give you the historical background right now.

The American Civil Liberties Union, about five years ago, took it upon themselves to issue a

statement on student rights. Then in 1964 the AAUP, American Association of University Professors, got up a statement outlining their responsibilities, the responsibility of the teacher, for the rights of the students. This was not an official document of the Association of University Professors. It was something that was drawn up by a committee that had been officially appointed by them and then was submitted to the organization and printed in their bulletin simply to get reactions.

They got considerable reaction in 1964, so they revised their statement and issued another statement in 1965. This is the so-called Committee S of the American Association of University Professors.

Watching this, meanwhile, was the Association of American Colleges, which is made up of administrators -- mostly presidents. It is a presidents' organization more than anything else, as I understand it. They were watching this development of the American Civil Liberties Union statement, and then they were more particularly interested, of course, in the AAUP statement. So they decided that they had better take a good, hard look at this, perhaps issue a statement of their own on student rights and freedoms, and this they did.

Then it was hoped, and it was the intention of AAUP too, when they issued their second statement after some revision, that they would get together with other organizations in the field who are concerned and interested, such as the Association of American Colleges, and our own NASPA, that they would get together and discuss their statement and perhaps see if we could not all arrive at something that we would all agree on in regard to student rights.

Dr. Armacost has been very active in the formation of the Association of American Colleges statement, which was got out and it was given the same title as the statement put out by AAUP. It follows the same format as their statement, but tries in some way -- I guess we would feel that way -- to tone down some of their, perhaps, more legalistic approaches to things, and to bring it into a framework with which we can live.

Dr. Armacost has been very active in the formation of the statement which was got together by the Association of American Colleges, and has been very active in the discussions which have followed, so I think that if he just gives us some of the background of the statements, particularly those which were put out by the AAUP -- remember, not official documents of

AAUP, but merely the document of committees of AAUP -- and then how the Association of American Colleges got up a corresponding statement following their pattern, point by point, but changing some of their statements. I think it would initiate our discussion very well if Dr. Armacost would give us as much of this background as he can, and details on the various points.

DR. PETER ARMACOST (Program Director, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.): Well, Father Ratterman asked me to give some informal comments that might kick off our discussion. I do this with some ambivalence because there are some here in the audience who are far more knowledgeable about this than I, and I would rather that you were here than I, but I hope to draw upon your expertise before the evening is over.

We also have some ambivalence because I am sorry that NASPA is in the position of reactor rather than initiator on a topic which logic would suggest we should be leaders on. There is no one, I do not think, on our campuses who is more concerned about the rights and responsibilities of students than you folks, yet nationally we have been in the position of waiting while three other organizations produced the statement, and it was not until AAUP's 1964 version that either NASPA or the group of college presidents that I work for really sat up and took notice.

Father Pat has reviewed the history of the three documents that are of most immediate concern to us. Those of you who are familiar with AAUP's statement are aware of the dramatic change in both tone and substance between the 1964 and the 1965 versions. It was really in some degree a result of this change that the situation that Father Pat described is true, namely that the AAC statement, which you have before you, is following pretty much the same format as that adopted by AAUP.

Before going into a brief comparison of the two documents, let me give you a brief idea of the plans for the future, vis-a-vis NASPA's involvement in this subject.

On May 13, Ed Williamson and Glen Nygreen represented NASPA in a meeting which was attended also by four other national associations, the National Student Association, NAWDC, the Association of American Colleges, and AAUP. The first part of the discussion was simply a review of what is going on.

It turns out that among the associations present there were just the two documents in existence,

the AAUP document and ours, so we focused our discussion on these two documents. All the participants there at the May meeting agreed on behalf of their respective associations that it would be desirable to participate in a working conference on student rights and responsibilities. This is something which has a somewhat shadowy origin, but I will agree that it is highly desirable.

It was agreed further that three other associations, the Association of Higher Education, the Association of American Universities, and the American Council on Education, should also be invited to participate in this discussion, and that each association should be asked to have up to five delegates at a working conference.

It was further agreed that a joint statement on student rights and responsibilities would be far preferable to several conflicting statements on the same topic, provided that we can reach agreement on basic principles, as Father Pat mentioned.

The spirit of cooperation in this meeting was very noteworthy and the attitude taken by AAUP, I think, is deserving of comment. They have seen their role as one of providing leadership in the discussion of a topic which is of concern to all of us, and I think all of those present evidenced some willingness to participate in a give and take situation in the hopes of coming up with a joint document.

There was general agreement that the first order of business in future meetings is to seek agreement on basic principles to be included in the statement, and it was generally agreed that a second important item for discussion is the nature and scope of follow-up activity based on the statement, even though it was obvious that there were certain differences among the associations on this matter.

Those of you familiar with the 1940 statement on academic freedom and tenure are aware of one of the reasons at least for concern with this matter. You will recall that was a joint statement of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges. Subsequent activity on behalf of those who were concerned with violations of the principles stated therein, however, has rested with AAUP, who has acted unilaterally without the cooperation or support of the Association of American Colleges or other associations. We were concerned that this not happen again, yet at the same time we did not want to have this statement become a club held over the head of college administrators, faculties and students. So it is a delicate situation involved here to some extent.

You may be interested in one suggestion that was made at this meeting. It was that the associations participating then might really sell the principles contained in the joint statement, if we can agree on one, to accrediting associations and let them handle the matter of following up activities, rather than having censure procedure or something like that, even if it were done by several associations, because we all agree that that was undesirable.

The discussions in May gave no clear indication as to where there might be substantive disagreement among the associations there represented, nor did they give any real indication of what the alignment might be, and I think this is just as well.

The meeting which was being planned then will be held November 13 and 14, and you will be informed of the progress made at that time.

This is a brief resume of the history of concern for student rights and responsibilities as it was reflected in the work of the national associations, and a description of plans for the future, vis-a-vis this significant area of concern.

For the purposes of stimulating discussion, let me communicate to you some of the general reactions to the AAUP statement, which were expressed in our Commission of Students and Faculty of the Association of American Colleges, which consists of fifteen college presidents who have been asked to serve three year terms dealing with general problems of student life, student services, and faculty personnel policies, and then compare the two statements on several points where I think we may wish to focus our discussion.

In terms of general reactions which also give a little bit of the context in which the AAC statement was developed, the first point of concern, I think was a recognition that there are really two facies in the development of policies and procedures providing and safeguarding student freedom to learn. On the one hand, such policies and procedures need to be developed with an awareness of the aims and objectives of the particular college in question, and on the other hand, as a second focus, the concern for the development of general standards of behavior governing practices in this area.

Our Commission felt that by not giving proper attention to the first of these two facies the AAUP statement might lead to a reduction of the desirable diversity in American higher education. We were trying to find a way of balancing the concern for the

particular style of life and the aims and objectives of one institution with these standards of behavior statements of principle on the other.

Secondly, we would much have preferred not to talk about academic freedom of students per se, with the difficulties of transferring this concept as it has historically been used into this new area, and we would prefer instead to talk about student rights and responsibilities, and I at least am of the opinion that were you to try to develop a statement like this you might begin by saying the primary right and responsibility of students is to exercise and cherish the freedom to learn.

You will note that in the most recent revision, which Father Pat had not seen, we actually changed the title of our document to "A Statement of Desirable Provisions for Student Freedom to Learn," though this follows the same general format suggested by AAUP.

As Father Pat emphasized, ours is not an official policy statement, and neither is AAUP's, for the very obvious reason that we want to keep it flexible while the discussions take place.

The third general reaction to the AAUP statement, as we were studying it, is that student freedom to learn is threatened by both bad administrative practice in many instances, and by the irresponsible use of freedom; and that the AAUP statement seemed to some extent to be concerned with taking care of those so-and-sos in the dean's office and elsewhere, which was a legitimate concern, but that also if it was really to be a vehicle for establishing student freedom to learn that it address itself to the responsible use of freedom as well.

It was interesting, I think, that in the joint meeting which we attended in May the AAUP expressed an awareness of the fact that their statement was developed initially out of a concern for the political freedoms of students, and protecting them, without total awareness, I think, of the implications of their statement for the total administration and the more global concern that college administrators may have. Secondly, that there was an awareness on the part of the AAUP representatives as expressed by Professor Monypenny, the Chairman of Committee S, that the whole concept of responsibility had been omitted from their document, at that time, they felt, because it was needless retort that might be used against them in subsequent discussions. This is a point upon which I think we can expect the AAUP, NSA, NASPA, AAC, and the other associations to come to some agreement without too much difficulty.

It would be fairly easy to identify some assumptions that seem implicit in the AAUP document. Perhaps we will wish to talk about these as the discussion develops. Some of you may have seen a paper which Ed Williamson and John Cowan did. It is unpublished, but I understand it is fairly widely circulated. They attempted to analyze some of the assumptions underlying the AAUP, the ACLU, and the NSA statements. In the process of doing so they identify eleven assumptions which they felt characterized the three documents in question.

One of these perhaps is of note because it does serve as the basis for some of the changes which we suggest in the document, namely, the assumption that students grow toward goodness if left uninfluenced and unrestrained. This is stated rather explicitly in the American Civil Liberties Union statement, and in various ways the AAUP statement seems to imply the same thing. Williamson and Cowan in their statements suggest that clearly this is not the case; no one lives in a situation where they are uninfluenced and unrestrained; and that a more appropriate hypothesis would be simply that faculty and administrators in creative ways should attempt to become part of the environment which influences student growth. Basic to this, of course, is the assumption that we were making in our Commission, that important learning occurs in the extracurriculum and is the responsibility of the college, and that it is no less reasonable to provide responsible officials who have authority in this aspect of the learning process than it is in the classroom.

This does not say, however, that we should not reexamine our assumptions as we proceed as educators in the extracurriculum, because it may well be that many bad administrative practices have been justified on the basis of assumptions that are somewhat questionable.

For the purpose of discussion, let me raise a number of questions which focus attention on differences between the two statements, the AAUP statement and that of the Association of American Colleges.

The Preamble is different, simply because we wanted to clarify the freedom for diversity which we felt is important, and to make clear that the statements before you in the AAUP statement are guidelines to be used by local campus administrations in the development of their own statements of policy and procedure rather than being a statement that should be transposed, lock, stock and barrel, into the college community.



The first question on which there was some difference between the two associations that is more or less substantive is the question of what is improper disclosure? This is section 1-C in the paper before you.

Another way of verbalizing the question that is the basis for the differences here is then what obligation does the professor have to the individual student, to the institution, and to society?

The statement before you, 1-C, is pretty much the statement of the American Civil Liberties Union document that appeared several years ago. It suggests, in contrast to the AAUP statement which simply says that information about student views, beliefs and political associations which professors acquire in the course of their work is confidential; and, secondly, the protection against improper disclosure is a serious professional obligation; and thirdly, the judgments of ability and character may be provided under appropriate circumstances. The statement before you differs from that, first, because of a concern for balancing an awareness of the professor's obligations, and secondly, because there was a fear among some of the people who reviewed the earlier AAUP document that consultation among faculty members in the interests and welfare of students might be discouraged by the statement as it was originally provided. Thirdly, in the process of developing Section 1-C here there was a concern for providing more guidelines to the professors than had been the case in the AAUP statement, although again the document before you borrows heavily from ACLU at this point.

A second question that served as a basis for differences between the two documents centers attention on Section 2, Student Records, namely, what is proper institutional policy regarding student records?

Another aspect of the question is how can you protect the political freedom of students without nurturing the definition of freedom which is freedom from accountability?

There are several respects in which this document before you is different from the AAUP statement on student records. In the first place, again, it was developed to indicate in this first sentence the importance of other obligations which the institution has to society as well as its obligation to protect the welfare of the individual student. So the first sentence is different from the AAUP's statement.

In order to avoid a concept of freedom which is freedom from accountability, there is recognition



in the AAC statement that there may be notations on transcript which recognize disciplinary action taken, if this is so ordered by special action of those taking the disciplinary action. There is no mention of political beliefs, as a matter of records. Perhaps we would be willing to say that no record should be kept which reflects the political beliefs of students, and rather it says that any records which reflect the political activities of students should be considered confidential and should be released only with the knowledge and consent of the students involved, except under legal compulsion.

This differs from the AAUP statement which said quite simply that no records should be kept which reflect the political activities or beliefs of students.

One other minor change in that section has to do with the wording in the last sentence where we express the concern that administrative staff and faculty members should respect confidential information, whereas the AAUP statement had focused specifically their attention on administrative staff and student personnel officers.

The third area in which there is some difference between the position of the AAUP and the position reflected in the document before you has to do with Section 3-B, Freedom of Association.

There was some concern that the AAUP statement which differs only in the last phrase from the AAC statement might permit taking in the AAUP's form the development of social fraternities, when the college is publicly opposed to them as an aspect of the educational program, and our Commission, at least, felt that the introduction of the phrase "consistent with the publicly stated policies of the college" made it possible to still protect the freedom of association of students in the sense that it was of concern to AAUP without raising the question of fraternities in a non-fraternity institution.

Section 3-B is another area where there are some differences in the positions reflected in the two documents. The question here is, should student organizations be permitted to function without a faculty adviser, and how should the adviser be selected?

The AAUP statement said, quite simply, that each organization should be free to choose its own campus adviser and institutional recognition should not be withheld or withdrawn solely because of the inability of a student organization to secure an

adviser. It said also that members of the faculty serve the college community when they accept the responsibility to advise and consult with student organizations. They should not have the authority to control the policy of such organizations.

The statement before you was developed in its present form in order (1) to indicate the discretion of the college in having a policy with regard to advisers. The phrase, "after conscientious effort", is inserted because of the belief of our Commission that sometimes the inability to find an adviser reflects a lack of desire to do so, which is reflected in turn in a lack of conscientious search.

Then there were phrases inserted in here, in order to focus some recognition on the fact that education occurs outside of the classroom and that the educational role of the faculty member extends beyond his concern for the classes which he teaches.

Section 3-B-4 has minor changes in wording which were put there to directly focus our attention on concern for national social fraternities and sororities, so that the phrase "including those affiliated with an extramural organization" is a departure from the text of the AAUP statement, but otherwise it is the same as that of the AAUP.

Section 3-B-6 then, the question of speakers policy is another area on which there is some disagreement and of course here the question is what is the nature -- what are the appropriate guidelines for a speakers policy? The difference between the two positions is quite simply reflected in two parts of the statement.

1. "When the purpose of such an invitation is consistent with the aims of the college" was added to the first sentence. This is weasel terminology in a sense and may cause some difficulty as we start pursuing this. I recall one of our Commission members talking about making educational experiences out of burlesque dancers being brought to the campus, and he seriously questioned whether that was justifiable in terms of education or necessary in terms of our concern for meeting other needs of students. So that weasel terminology was put in there.

The more basic difference with the AAUP statement is that whereas the AAUP document says that the only routine procedures established should be those necessary to insure the orderly scheduling of facilities, the AAC statement before you indicates that there are other reasons for having routine procedures, namely those that are necessary to insure

the responsible preparation for the event and that the occasion is conducted in a manner appropriate to the academic community.

I think in the minds of our Commission members at least, the speakers policy that would be most likely found on their campuses would be one that says quite simply that students may invite any person of their own choosing, provided that he is willing to submit to questions immediately following the occasion. I am not saying that there has to be an opposing view presented formally by another person, but simply that in academic fashion he submit to questions, and that at least in some of these institutions the presidents were of a mind of saying that the occasion would be closed to the general public, but open to the academic community and to the press. There was nothing secretive about it, but that there could not be large groups of non-students brought in, or people not part of the academic community who might have purposes there other than educational purposes.

Section 3-D, the one on student publications, is quite a departure from the AAUP statement. The question, of course, is what is the nature of the freedom of the student press, and what provisions are necessary in order to insure adequate freedom for the student press?

The statement that is before you differs from the AAUP statement for the following reasons:

There is an attempt here in this statement to state that different degrees of independence lead to different degrees of responsibility to the academic community, and to focus awareness of the fact that the publishers are the ones who have editorial freedom rather than the editor, and in certain circumstances the institution itself is in fact the publisher of the newspaper and does have certain responsibilities that pertain thereto.

Then there was an attempt in this document to clarify the responsibilities of both the institution in providing freedom, and of the editors in exercising their freedom. In a sense it differs from AAUP by attempting to introduce a stronger statement of the responsibility of the student press.

Section 4 deals with the off-campus freedom of students. Again, there are some differences with the AAUP statement arising out of our dealing with the question, to what extent does membership in the academic community impose limitations on student exercise of citizenship freedoms? And to what extent should

the institution be concerned with the off-campus behavior of students?

In general, the differences between the two statements reflect a concern by our Commission to balance the concept of freedom with that of responsibility is that the first sentence is new. The suggestion that as members of the academic community the students are subject to special obligations is an introduction by our Commission, which in part reflects their belief that there are higher standards in the academic community which might require that citizenship freedoms be exercised in a responsible fashion, consistent with the expectations of the academic community.

In a sense the question here that is being addressed is the question of whether or not there is such a thing as parallel jeopardy? Are there two sets of standards, those of civil jurisdiction and those of the academic community?

As a result, in Section B, as opposed to the AAUP statement, where it says, there in the middle of the paragraph, "only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct from those of the civil jurisdiction," the statement here before you simply says, "only when the interests as an academic community are clearly involved in terms of well-defined standards of behavior expected in the academic community and they are being violated, quite apart from the standards of the civil jurisdiction."

The final area in which there is some difference between the two statements -- well, in Section 5 there are two kinds of concerns here.

One is the concern that in Section 5-A of the AAUP statement which focused on notice of standards there was some feeling that the AAUP statement might tend to lead to legalistic concerns and adversary proceedings which did not serve the academic community well. More particularly, the AAUP said that offenses should be as clearly defined as possible, and such vague phrases as "undesirable conduct" or "conduct injurious to the best interests of the institution" should be avoided. Conceptions of misconduct, particularly to the institution, need clear and explicit definition.

The feeling of our Commission was that whereas we agree in sympathy with this statement, to rule out behavior on the basis of such concepts altogether would lead to the development of legal codes in colleges and universities, which were far too long and complex to serve the academic community well, but at

the same time it was important that if we were to maintain such "vague concepts" as conduct injurious to the college or university, to make clear that the interpretation of these phrases or these general standards and expectations must be consistent with the principles of substantive due process which seem to be emerging in the courts of law, namely the principles of reasonable control over student behavior, and the criterion of relevancy, is the regulation and its interpretation something that is of concern to the academic institution vis-a-vis its intended purposes and objectives?

In an attempt to avoid the legalistic and adversary proceedings we developed the section that is before you.

Of course, the final question in this section is, what are the essential elements of fundamental fair play which must be provided in order to guarantee procedural due process? In Section 5-D we attempted to rough these out in terms of the essentials of fair play in saying that in all situations this requires that a student be informed of the nature of the charges against him, that he be given a fair opportunity to refute them, and that the institution not be arbitrary in its actions.

This is taken from several of the court decisions that have been landmarks in this area.

There is a further suggestion that the criterion for the formality of the proceedings has to do with more than just the seriousness of the offense, and the degree of personalization in the community -- in other words, the procedures necessary to guarantee fundamental fair play may be different in a college of 400 or 500 than they are in a college or university of 20,000, while recognizing that the essentials just mentioned are necessary in all situations.

The other difference really in the hearing committee procedure section is the recognition or the belief on the part of our Commission that hearing committee proceedings were absolutely essential as appellate possibilities -- or possibilities for appeal -- rather than automatically being used whenever the offense was serious. We feel very strongly that if a student questions the fairness of the penalties, he should be granted the privilege of a hearing before a regularly constituted hearing committee, or if he questions the statement of offense.

The other difference with regard to the hearing committee proceedings has to do with Section 5 where, rather than subscribing to the belief that cross

examination should be a part of the hearing committee procedure, our Commission felt that this was not necessary in order to guarantee procedures of fair play, and for various reasons, even though I think as a Dean I, myself, would be quite happy in giving cross examination, the Commission felt that that was not necessary but that if witnesses giving testimony against a student accused did not do so in his presence, then an adequate summary of the nature of the testimony and other evidence against him should be furnished to him in advance of his own testimony, and that if there is no opportunity to question adverse witnesses, the hearing committee has a special responsibility to establish the objectivity of the witnesses, and the credibility of his testimony.

So in their concern for not introducing the adversary proceeding and cross examination, there is a specification of some of the obligations of the hearing committee in order to protect the welfare of the student.

There was a minor difference in terms of the finality of the decision of the hearing committee, and the suggestion that the student's right of appeal is to the president who may refer the case to the governing board, rather than saying, as the AAUP did, that the student has a right to appeal directly to the Board of Regents if the hearing committee decision is unsatisfactory to him.

The differences between the AAUP position, and the AAC position, which have been reflected in this document, are the result of concern for these questions, and what I have tried to do is give you some indication of why the position before you here is different from the AAUP position.

I realize in doing so, some of you may not be totally familiar with the AAUP statement, and I have this here and can pick up the slack where you wish, but I feel at this point, Father Pat, maybe we can pick up the discussion wherever you want, and I think our wish is that the discussion be between you, as much as it is addressed to us here on the podium. So let us pick up the discussion wherever you wish.

CHAIRMAN RATTERMAN: I am sure that all of you are experiencing the same difficulty that I am experiencing. The document that you have before you, I never saw before coming up on the platform this evening, and I am sure you never saw it before you came into the hall. I at least had the possibility of looking at some previous drafts of the document, and of having studied somewhat the AAUP statement.

However, I imagine all of you feel that the thing to do now is to dismiss the meeting, everybody retire to their rooms, have an opportunity to read over it, form some opinions, and return at some later hour to discuss it. We cannot do that, so the discussion obviously is going to suffer.

I think it is important that you at least know that there are organizations that are interested in what I think have been some rather irresponsible, at times, approaches toward student freedom, and if you are familiar with the document or report that was prepared by Dean Kauffman -- he is now at the University of Wisconsin on the Madison campus -- he hit them pretty hard on this about being irresponsible, in his judgment, in some of the things that they were advocating in regard to students, and not judging situations in their full academic context.

Now, I think all of us felt this way. I know a year ago I felt very strongly about this, that here was the United States National Student Association coming up with a statement, and then the American Civil Liberties Union, and the AAUP, all of an extremely liberal bent, to say the least, and I sometimes like to feel that I am something of a liberal myself, but my students do not, but that they were not seeing the thing in the context that we were forced to see it.

I know that you are all at least very pleased to hear that the Association of American Colleges, for one, and NASPA, and other organizations are interested in getting together with these people, knocking our heads together, and saying, "Look, let's get something that we can all live with a little bit."

Another important thing to remember, of course, is that these documents are in transition right now. There is no final statement.

Another thing -- and Dr. Armacost mentioned this -- nobody is issuing any statement which they say should be taken lock, stock and barrel, and applied to any single campus in the United States. But I think all of us feel we would like to have something that a lot of really fine professional and experienced minds have gone over and they have at least come together and said, "All right, we can agree at least among ourselves on these general principles, and this is what we have."

I think, too, it helps all of us professionally on our own campus to be able to refer to something like this, instead of consistently discussing subjects and arguing points with the students,

having it appear that it is just our viewpoint. So, with these understandings that, "All right, this is a new document for you. You have never seen it before," perhaps we can have something of a discussion here.

Remember that we are merely up here as resource persons, and not as experts. Since Dr. Armacost has been so much more active in the formation of the AAC document, and is so much better informed in regard to the discussions that have already gone on in this regard, I am sure you will find him a much better informed resource person than you will find me.

At this point we will take questions from the floor, and according to the NASPA formula, when you speak, you must give your name and your institution.

... Discussion from the floor followed ...

---



GENERAL INFORMATION SESSION D  
Sunday Evening - June 26, 1966

"A Systems Approach to Constructing  
Student Housing"

General Information Session D, meeting in the Evergreen and Pacific Rooms, convened at eight-thirty o'clock, Mr. Clayton Kantz, A.I.A., Senior Architect, University of California at Berkeley, presiding.

CHAIRMAN KANTZ: We would like very much to conduct this affair this evening on quite an informal basis so that at any time you have questions, please feel free to interrupt.

My name is Clayton Kantz. I work for the Vice President for Physical Planning and Construction for the University of California. This office is charged with the over-all programming, design and construction of all physical facilities at the University of California on its nine campuses and miscellaneous other installations.

On my left is Mr. Ezra Ehrenkrantz, who is President of Building Systems Development Corporation, Berkeley. This is the firm which the University of California has retained as technical consultant on this project.

This project -- if I wax eloquent later in the evening, you will have to forgive me because I am extremely excited about it, and I am sure that from your standpoint you think that we are after our cake, that we want our cake and we want to eat it too, and this is true, because what this project is is quite extensive. It is a research project, a design project, a development project, and a construction project all rolled up into one entity.

Over the next decade, the University of California will build between forty and fifty thousand student bed spaces. We are quite concerned as to how we build, what we build, and why we build.

The University of California is probably very much like your institution in that the regents of the University and the entire university community subscribe to the basic tenets or policies concerning residence halls, four items. The residence halls will provide food; it shall provide shelter, obviously; in addition to which it shall provide an educational and a cultural experience. I must confess that the University of California does not do much more than pay lip service to the last two, and in our wanderings over the country

we have discovered that your institutions are in the same boat as we.

We are hopeful, in fact, we expect that what we do in the next three years will permit this situation to change, and change drastically and radically, that an opportunity for an educational and a cultural experience by the students attending not only our institution but all those across the land will have a far better chance than they have had in the past.

A little bit about the project -- why did it start?

Like many things relative to change in a university, it started from student unrest. And it started from lack of money. Up until 1958 in the State of California the taxpayers funded our residence hall program -- funded it completely. In a five year period, between 1958 to 1963, the support from the taxpayers in the State of California changed from whole and complete support to not one thin dime, which means, of course, that the student has to carry the load.

At the same time, shall we say, the situation at Berkeley was occurring. There were indications of occupancy fall-out in the occupancy rate at other of the miscellaneous campuses. Coupled with this, we were doing a lot of thinking about what the residence hall should be and what it should not be.

We looked at it this way, that in the year 2000, which is a tremendously long way away (we just cannot visualize, we do not think about it as being very near to hand), the University amortizes its buildings on a 40 year basis so that on that premise the units that we build and open in the next two, three, or four years, when the year 2000 comes we will have paid for three-fourths of them. We are deeply concerned, when the quantity and quality of knowledge generally in this country is doubling every decade. We are wondering just what is going to be the occupancy rate in residence hall facilities in the year 2000 if we continue as we have -- that is, two in a room, double loaded corridor, in the best traditions of the hotel.

We have also noticed that in the food facility that there are two other institutions that feed in the same general manner as the residence hall: military establishments and prisons.

The programming of these residence halls has of course traditionally been a mixture of everyone within the university environment and community, and

we hope that it will continue this way. And what we are hoping to do is to give the situation a much better chance, because what this particular project which we call the University Residential Building System -- and we know it, of course, as URBS -- is, is that we expect to obtain, and I say this completely honestly, we expect to obtain new, not now obtainable, parts and pieces -- or if you wish to become technical, we use the term "components" for building, on the premise that if there is a statement of user requirements made clearly and concisely enough for a particular type of structure, residence halls in this case, that we can truly obtain from industry parts and pieces that are uniquely suitable in solving the particular problem for this type of structure. Now, how we do this, I will leave to Mr. Ehrenkrantz to explain later.

Going back a little bit, on the problem of the University of California, the problem is serious as far as we are concerned. We have just a few over 80,000 on all the campuses this past fall. Before the end of this century that 80,000 will have increased to approximately a quarter of a million, at least.

We have another problem, that the student mix is changing. Whereas in comparatively recent years we had 60 percent undergraduates and 40 percent in the graduate division, this is changing so that within possibly the decade, and certainly within two decades, we will have 60 percent graduate students, and 40 percent undergraduates.

I do not know whether you are aware of it or not, but in the State of California, by law the University of California accepts only those students in the upper one-eighth of the highschool graduating class. The state college system is completely separate, in no way tied with the university system. Again by law, they can accept students from the upper one-fourth of the high school class.

Then there is still a third public institution, the junior college system. They take the students whose grades are less than that, or students who for some reason or another wish to attend there, or cannot afford to attend the state university system.

Students from the junior college and the state college system can transfer to the university in later years if their grades are at a certain level.

So you can see, when you add all of the kids who are in our state, the problem of residence halls and the housing of students gets to be one of fairly good size and importance.

We have other problems. In addition to the change of the mix, which I might also add is also a change in the age of the students from the 18 to 22 year old, the graduate student instead is 26 to his early thirties. There is the other problem then that that graduate student probably is married, and it seems to be a law of nature that when you are married you have children.

Then there are some more problems. Construction costs are increasing at four to six percent every year. At the same time the maintenance and operation costs are increasing more or less at the same rate.

All of these things wrapped up together then give us quite a range of problems. As I say, we propose to solve some of them by this particular university residential building systems project, wherein we are seeking new not-now-obtainable parts and pieces for buildings.

In our contract with a consultant, we have listed quite a number of things that we want. He has a real tough job if he fulfills it. With him here at this stand, I cannot indicate at all that we do not expect to achieve everything we want, a full 100 percent.

MR. EHRENKRANTZ: It's on tape. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN KANTZ: Yes. But in our thinking about this, what we want is a degree of flexibility that in effect the residential hall building literally becomes a laboratory in itself, so that within the time context and the changes imposed by both students (their needs and their preferences) and the university policies and requirements, that this residence hall building actually can change.

For instance, a residence hall that we will open in 1970 might open as what you would know as a residence hall for single students. It could very well be that because of the returning Viet Nam veterans and their problems, or the problems of those that did not go, that there is a real uprising and a series of student problems that create the desirability, apparently, to change the plan and figuration of that single student residence hall. We have told the consultant that we want to be able to do that over the weekend.

Now, we grant readily that under today's conditions you cannot do that. You cannot change the floor plan configuration over the weekend, and even if you could, you could not afford it.

We have told him further that in a later time context we want to take that same building and convert it within a reasonable time and financial context, literally, to a married student apartment building for students without children. And in still another time context to convert that to married students with children. And possibly in a still later context, convert it back to single students.

None of this can be done today within either a time or monetary context that is anything approaching reasonable. It is a big job.

The way this thing is being set up, the project has been authorized by the regents of the university on the basis that the University of California will contribute one-third of the development costs by the basic team, approximately \$200,000. We have received from the Educational Facilities Laboratories additional funding approximately two-thirds of the cost, or approximately \$400,000. In addition to this \$600,000 which the URBS team will expend, we expect industry to expend possibly \$10-, \$11-, \$12-million in research and development.

Then we are going to go ahead and construct units which will cost -- depending upon the number -- at least \$25-million.

Under this particular program the regents at the University have authorized the construction of a minimum of 4,500 student bed spaces, up to a maximum of 9,000. This 9,000 represents approximately one-third of that which we will build in the same period of time. The period of time I have reference to is occupancy in the fall of 1970, '71, and '72.

There is a very interesting relationship on this because normally a university hires a technical consultant and tells him what they want done, and the consultant goes off to his office and goes to work. In this case the University has placed myself and another man directly in the technical consultant's office, and we are working very much like a marriage. We must be on the honeymoon because so far we have not had any fights. On the other hand, we are only about six months into the program and of course the program will be completed with the occupancy of the last unit in the fall of 1972.

I am going to leave all of the technical ways, whys and whats, and what we found so far, to Ezra. But very briefly, the way the program works is that the University, as the client, aided by the technical consultant, establishes in detail what we call the user

requirements. I venture to say that when this is completed early next fall that this will be the most complete concise statement of what a residence hall actually should be that has as yet been developed in this country.

The technical consultant then takes this statement of user requirements and converts it to what we call performance specifications. Now, performance specifications are not the technical specifications that the architect or engineer prepares in the normal situation, but rather are a statement in words of what we want, rather than in terms of what metal or what material, how big, how thick, how deep, how much horsepower, etc., etc.

These performance specs then are released to industry with a formal call for bids. Industry responds, submits to the University their proposals, both in terms of design and in terms of money, their answer to our user requirements.

A period of testing is then conducted to determine the appropriateness and the compliance of these parts and pieces to the original specs, and then we go ahead and use it in the buildings in the usual way.

When I speak of parts and pieces, or components, I want you to understand that we are speaking of parts and pieces, that we are not speaking in terms of pre-fabricated units, because on the nine campuses of the University we are just as different as day is from night. It is imperative that there be complete freedom of expression and everything else so that the campus at Santa Cruz can have their redwood siding, and their stucco, and their low-rise. The campus at L.A. can have their high-rise, built of concrete, steel, type 1 construction, fireproof, etc. By the same token each campus has its own ideas about the plan configuration in two dimensions, and the way the mouse shapes up in three dimensions.

So in seeking out components we do not intend to seek components for the exterior of the building whatsoever. We do intend to seek components for the structural framing, the heating, and the air conditioning, the electrical lighting, but not including electric service nor electric power; partitions, the finishes on ceilings, walls, partitions, floors, the case work, and the furniture.

This list will probably represent from 40 to 60 percent of the total cost of the building. The site development work, the utilities, in effect the

structural system up through the grade level will not be a part of the system.

To make this effective, of course, it is rather obvious that the participation by industry, and the extent of that participation is very important, because if industry does not participate we are not going to get anywhere at all.

Prior to the instigation of this project and its activation, we made a feasibility study which indicated that with this bait, or carrot, of 4500 units minimum industry was truly interested.

We have a further reasonable basis upon which we are proceeding in that our technical consultant had recently completed another program for high schools along this same line, using these same basic methods, in which he obtained a very high degree of success.

I am getting into techniques, and I had better quit.

Let me change my train of thought for a moment. We have the program where the University, as planned, is literally working hand-in-glove with the technical consultant within his office. We have assurances from representatives of industry that we have enough units to afford the initial bait or carrot or attraction for them to do truly research and development work on this type of a project. They are aware, of course, or they will be aware that the University of California is but a very small segment of the some 2200 universities and colleges in North America, and that if we provide for our particular system, the University of California, requirements which fit in general the requirements across the land, the market potential is enormous.

Again, we are trying to make certain that we do that, because the University then has set up what we call a National Advisory Committee. Dean Shaffer back there, from Indiana, is a member of it. Other representatives come from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Chicago, California, Utah -- what else? At any rate, there are twelve of them on the National Advisory Committee, representing all segments of interested parties that by some stretch of the imagination could be associated with the residential hall program.

Like everything that is pie-in-the-sky, this program has a drawback. That drawback -- we do not truly know yet how we are going to solve it satisfactorily, because we could obtain the parts and pieces, the components, that truly do a wonderful job, but

because they are parts and pieces they have to be put together, and for you gentlemen who have worked on a building programming committee, you are quite aware that a building is no better than its basic, original program, so that it is going to become imperative that the people who put the program together for these buildings on our various campuses, the Deans of Students, the residence hall operators, the campus architects, student representatives, representatives of the faculty, the chancellor, are going to have to work together on a scale of cooperation that exceeds by considerable that which has occurred in the past.

There is a second problem. Even if we get a topnotch program, we are also going to have to find a topnotch architect to put this together on paper and transform that paper solution into three dimensions. The design creativity, the sensitivity of the architect in private practice is going to be very important. We think that there may be some problems in this line.

We found out lots of things about residence halls in the six months that we have been operating. Some things we thought we knew previously; some things we knew we knew; and some things are brand new. Rather than going into those myself, I am going to leave something for Ezra to talk about. I will let Mr. Ehrenkrantz have it at this point.

MR. EZRA EHRENKRANTZ (President, Building Systems Development Corp., Berkeley, California): Thank you, Clayton. As I was sitting there listening to all the things that you were expecting of the Systems, you almost had a second drawback, and that is to find another consultant. (Laughter)

The program that we are working on is indeed an exciting one. We have some precedents, by way of a program for high schools wherein the extreme need of the school districts began to provide the opportunity to do things by procedures that districts under anything but extreme need would not dare try to do. So, sometimes the greater the problem the better the seed for solution might be, and this is what perhaps is going to be the case in terms of the student residence halls. At least, we hope so. The problems are indeed very considerable.

The buildings at the U.C. campuses, and perhaps elsewhere around the country, as we have been able to look at them, tend to follow some old traditional patterns that perhaps evolved at a time when the program had more to do with how to police and control students than it did in terms of providing an appropriate



place to live. In designing buildings and double loaded corridors so that each double room faces into the corridor, it not only provides an opportunity for a resident assistant to walk up and down, policing it very carefully, but it also provides the necessity for one to do so, because whenever two students gather in the hall and start to talk with the sound permeating through the doors, the opportunities for a few students to disturb all the rest are so great that the need for policing becomes quite considerable.

One of the approaches that we are trying to take to the study, developing an appropriate program for the user requirements, is to analyze the development of different plan types, and find out what we can do with components, plan forms, perhaps, to reduce the need for regulations as much as possible.

This perhaps provides some of the negative thinking in terms of the way in which the requirements begin to evolve, in terms of partitions that can take tacks, pictures, chalk, and many other implements or activities which are normal to students pursuing educational activities, which are not normal to the type of products that are currently being used in these buildings, which were either designed for houses, or for office buildings, or for some other building form rather than for residence halls.

We have the very major requirement of flexibility that has been spoken of amply this evening, which has as corollary that of variety. It is important to give choice, as different students would like to use space in different ways.

The pattern of choice that is given also changes with time, and this is where we need the flexibility to move things over the course of time and provide for new patterns of living. This means that we are not only interested in moving, let us say, the bed and the desk around, or running in a partition in a double room to make two single rooms, but we are interested in the entire social pattern that takes place within the residence hall.

There are a lot of experiments that are now being made at various institutions leading toward the use of suites, apartments, larger groupings of students. This is the first real break-away from the double rooms, except for a few eastern colleges, such as Harvard which has had a program of a type of suite arrangement ever since its founding.

In this case we find some of the suites developed around groups of students, perhaps four, others

six, eight, as many as ten students who have some common facility that is supposed to unite them. In some cases it is nothing more than the bathroom; and in others, living spaces, lounges, other social spaces.

As we begin to look at these spaces, we begin to find that a lot of our first tentative approaches to providing something other than a double room are not bearing up as we perhaps had hoped. We begin to find, for example, that when a large group of students share a single space that perhaps we set up sub-groups within the residence hall that form a very tight and closed circle, and do not mix with other students as perhaps they should, and so reduce their opportunities for making outside contacts very considerably. If you have only one student who is your roommate perhaps you are forced to meet others rather readily. When you move around in a group of eight, you may consider that it be all and end all of your social life.

There is another problem. This group of students becomes very friendly, so that they like to do things together. One person wants a cup of coffee, and he asks the next one to go, and in turn they ask the next one and they all troop down together, or for a hamburger, or what have you. So that six students, for example, living together, have five to interrupt each one, instead of on a one to one basis.

These perhaps become some of the problems that are noticed by the various institutions making the first experiment.

On the other hand, we begin to wonder as to whether or not other patterns might be visible. Perhaps a number of these suites can work together, so if you had three suites of six students, perhaps each of the six share certain facilities together, together the three suites have other facilities, you develop a hierarchy of relationships, and surely one person wanting a cup of coffee does not get seventeen others to join him. He just picks out the one or two perhaps that he would like to go with.

What I am trying to say here is that we have reached a point where we know that the old pattern no longer works as a pattern of organization. Students are rebelling. They are leaving the campuses. They are setting up their own pads, within a mile radius. The dropout, for example, at the University of California is 50 percent of the freshmen come back, 50 percent of the sophomores, 50 percent of the juniors, and so on. So the dropout is very, very considerable, resulting in a relatively young mix of students within

the residence hall, which is something which may be debated in terms of its advantages or disadvantages. In most debates that we have the strength seems to lie very heavily in terms of disadvantages.

So we are faced with some very considerable problems here, and it is not just a matter of moving the furniture around, or putting in another partition; but it is the whole social organization of the residence hall that one wishes to work with.

When Mr. Kantz talks of a building having such flexibility that it becomes a laboratory for its own evolution, this calls for a social evolution as well as a partition evolution. This then must come from programs that are established by the responsible people at each of the university campuses. We can no longer think of a building as a particular facility that you move in to have single configuration. But the building has to be planned at least three times over: The building that you move into; the building perhaps that you might like to move into if you felt you had the staff, or if the students were mature enough, or if you were sure that you could retain the same number of seniors, percentagewise, in the residential hall system, as you have freshmen; then perhaps the kind of facility that you would like to move toward.

We are beginning to deal with changes in communications systems that make it inevitable that seniors and graduate students eventually requiring computer terminals, access to retrieval systems, slow scan television to the reserve book room of the library, will no longer be able to live off campus. In order to do a Master's thesis you are going to have to live in a residence hall at some point in the relatively near future.

What kind of a facility must be provided for these more mature students who at the present time are literally driven out of the halls, due to the fact that they are not designed to provide a hospitable environment?

These then become the problems that we are trying to deal with and grapple with. We obviously cannot do it by predicting the future. We can only begin to approach the problem by providing options and by considering the buildings that will be constructed to really act as laboratories, hoping to provide a basis for the accumulation of knowledge over the next number of years so we can little by little move in, perhaps, on the more appropriate patterns that will come up later.

If I can get back to the precedent that we had for a moment, with respect to our school projects, wherein we now have well over a million square feet of schools in California under construction on the Systems basis. We started with a group of school districts who felt that they were unable to meet their needs within a state aid budget. They agreed to build 22 specific schools with unknown building products, which would be designed to unwritten performance specifications, which would be written when the user requirements were fully studied.

Many of you are perhaps members of school boards. You have some idea as to the pressures that must build up for school districts to take this sort of gamble four or five years hence, or making commitments for specific buildings to be built four or five years hence. These districts did this, and as the program has progressed they are now able to get from industry literally everything they have asked for, and these schools are going up within the state aid budget to give you some ideas of that this has meant. Flexibility is just as necessary in schools.

I think perhaps the secondary school educators are doing a better job than those at the university level at the moment; and being a member of the faculty at Berkeley, I am able to speak from the inside as well as from the outside on this project, in that they are doing much more by way of studying the different methods of teaching and experimenting to do the same. They wanted this great deal of flexibility and particularly had the feeling that whereas a second-hand house, when it no longer fits because you have a new child, a new car, or a new hobby, you sell it and move into a new one. The market for second-hand schools is nowhere near as substantial, so as part of the flexibility we are providing average spans of 70 feet for the schools, instead of the more traditional 30 feet.

We are providing for the school districts air conditioning which will supply plus or minus two degrees, summer and winter, at breathing level, at the ankle level. We discovered interestingly enough that most middle aged teachers, leading a rather sedantary life, have poor circulation and so with normal air stratification cold feet results in their turning up the thermostats and putting the students to sleep. (Laughter) Moreover, the performance of the airconditioning is guaranteed by maintenance contract for twenty years, on a 24-hour basis.

It is extremely interesting to find that manufacturers are just delighted to be able to bid in a

way wherein they can back up the performance of their products, or they are forced to back up the performance of their products over a long period of time. This means that they can sleep nights. Their job of bidding is not to see how much they can do by way of cheapening a system to get the bid, but rather to determine what kind of performance they can give in the most efficient way, knowing that because the maintenance contract is in, their competitors will not take out a little bit more of the quality than they were able to, thereby getting a price.

It is always quite a battle on the part of manufacturers going on first cost bids, to determine how much they can get away with cheapening the products and how much will the others do it, and can they do it just a little bit more and thereby get the job.

In terms of the residence halls, we are now talking with industry on a 40-year basis of maintaining the airconditioning systems within the residence hall. To give you some idea of what the costs are in this for the schools, our first cost was \$2,900,000. Our 20-year cost for maintenance, operation, and first cost was \$12,800,000. There was half a million dollars per year to operate and maintain the airconditioning. When you take into account first costs, it is not a very great percentage of the total cost.

Our cost of maintenance is 3.3 percent of first cost per year. By analysis, our school districts pay very close to 20 percent per year for maintenance, building on a first cost only basis. I think this becomes extremely significant. This tends to take the whole problem, and we are studying that for the residence halls, on a total cost basis. For example, people will say that gang bathrooms are cheaper. If four or six students share a smaller, private bath, they may be responsible for the upkeep or for the cleaning of this facility. When you begin to take the total cost of the bathroom facilities, we readily find that these smaller baths, kept up by the students themselves, cost less in terms of the actual dollars which the students will eventually have to repay, over the useful life of the building, than the large gang facilities.

This type of consideration obviously must come into play in the total program.

We also become very interested in plan efficiencies. We know that there are residence halls built around the country with as little as eight percent of the total area devoted to circulation, staircases, elevators.

On the other hand, we find other facilities with upwards of 25 percent of the total area. We find that some of the point tower, vertical house types take the least amount of circulation; the core plans, double-loaded corridor, take the most. So this becomes an important part of the program.

We begin to look at the problems of flexibility and variety, and we begin to find that the rooms themselves are too small to provide, very frequently, the kind of variety that the students want. So one of the things that we hope to buy with the potential savings of a Systems approach is more square footage to the point that the rooms are of an appropriate size to provide for the kind of reasonable variety that the students have a right to expect.

When you go into a residence hall and find the bed, which is the only piece of furniture that can move, pushed up against the front door of the room, so that when you enter the room you have to walk on to the bed and down the other side, you get the idea that the students' desire for variety, or to have something which is unique, may be quite strong. I think we have a responsibility to develop facilities that will make this possible.

Therefore, we have a program set forth where we must be able to first analyze, and then provide for an appropriate physical environment, heat, light, air, sound. We must provide for a great deal of flexibility in the use of the space, a great deal of flexibility in terms of the student groupings that might exist within a given space. We have to provide for individual needs that make it impossible to type students.

In looking at residence halls, and talking with students, we begin to find a difference in study patterns. There are certain activities that students will do seated at their desk on a hard chair; others, perhaps that require less writing, in a soft chair with a good reading lamp; others will do some of the same activities in bed. There are others who do all of their writing in bed. There are some students who will do at least 70 percent of their total studying in bed. At the same time you will find that others will do everything on the floor, including typing, even with an appropriate typing table made available. It is just the way it is done.

There are other people who never study in their rooms. They will go to the library; they cannot stand not being a part of it. They want to go where the action is. And then they will withdraw from the action and do their studying.

So within this kind of a system or situation we have to provide the appropriate nooks and crannies. I am sure all of you have had the same kind of experience that we have, visiting various residence halls with the big lounge rooms, "furniture show rooms" they are usually called by students, that are frequently empty. You see tremendous pleas by way of student comments for little typing rooms, little spaces, unprogrammed spaces, so they can program them in terms of the kinds of special interests that might evolve within a particular group. All of this becomes part, as well, of providing an appropriate environment.

So I think perhaps this gives some kind of an insight into the way in which the study so far is beginning to find requirements. We can say that we do find opportunities beginning to emerge in discussions with industry to develop products which will make it possible to provide facilities that will offer this degree of variety, performance, flexibility, and part of the aspect of doing this is taking the building and studying it on a total cost basis -- not in terms of what it will cost to move in, but in effect what it will cost to move out in forty years. As the student rents are based on this cost, this is the only one that really counts, so that this becomes the basis of the program.

One of the most important things then that has to come about is to develop the System in such a way, begin to work with people at the various campuses so that there is full realization of what can be done.

When we were programming schools, and talking to high schools, and talking to educators for the first time, the program was always in physical terms. "We want rooms that look like so." We spoke to the architects who were working for those school districts, and they always spoke in terms of educational requirements. "Well, this school is interested in team teaching," each one knowing the problems in their own area, and that they were so difficult they did not want to tackle them. The problems in the other person's area were obviously much more simple, and some ready solutions could be found.

I think we have the same thing when programs come out for residence halls. We see the programs that go to architects, not only from U. of C. campuses. We have been fortunate to get many from other campuses around the country, and I dare say some of the people here have been on some of those committees, and we begin to say, "The rooms shall be 130 square feet for one student, 200 square feet for two students. There shall be double loaded corridors." And in effect you have

designed the building. The architect comes in, he gets the desk size, arranges the furniture, determines where the typing room is going to be, and he does what should be your program.

The thing is all backwards, because we are passing the ball. The real problems in our own areas are so difficult to meet that we very frequently try to solve these things by avoiding them and dealing with the problems of someone else.

What an architect really needs, for example, is for someone to be able to say, "We want an opportunity to try out at least three major patterns of living within a residence hall, and they should all be superimposed -- it should be possible to superimpose them within the same configuration. The patterns that we see are as follows." And these can each be laid out and described.

I think this is the kind of thing which is necessary. This puts the challenge where it should be, on the architect to design the kind of a building that will meet your needs. Once the building is fixed, the program that you can run within it is severely hampered or limited, and you have to make sure that the buildings are capable of providing for the appropriate programs.

I think perhaps this might be a good place to stop and see if there are any questions that deal with the project, and to the extent that we get into further detail, I think we will be able to respond as we are actually at this stage quite well into at least beginning to find the nature of the problem, although we are quite a way from solving it.

CHAIRMAN KANTZ: Thank you, Ezra.

... Discussion from the floor followed ...



SECOND GENERAL SESSION  
Monday - June 27, 1966

The Second General Session, meeting in the Grand Ballroom, convened at nine o'clock, Dean Edmund G. Williamson, Dean of Students, University of Minnesota; President Elect NASPA, presiding.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMSON: In order to conserve time and have some residual at the end for any questions you may raise, I would like to begin. This is the second general session, and at this session we are here to hear a message from our President, to be followed by the reactions of three reactors. I am going to name them now and ask them to please take their position and make their reaction without further introduction, in order to save time.

Dr. Phillip Tripp, of good long standing, and standing good in this Association for many years, with the U. S. Office of Education, now in a Research Specialist job.

Dean Miriam Shelden, of the University of Illinois, President-Elect of the National Dean of Women's Association.

Dean Robert Shaffer of Indiana University, also President of COSPA, and of many other points in the Universe. (Laughter)

Our speaker, the President of our Association, needs no introduction, and I am not going to give him any introduction. He is well conditioned to speak to us on a topic of interest and of concern to us. Currently, as you know, he is Dean of Students at Hunter College, New York.

I first knew him when he was Dean, or Assistant Dean I believe he was, in this institution, one cold, rainy night, with a flat tire. But since then he has pumped it up and he is ready to go today. (Laughter) Roll, will you please, Glen. (Applause)

PRESIDENT GLEN T. NYGREEN (Presidential Address): Thank you, Ed. I well remember that flat tire, but I also remember the very stimulating experiences which followed because of your contributions to our meeting here, of the Northwest College Personnel Association.

I am just a little timorous about this venture this morning. I have the feeling that I am looking at a group of people who know a great deal more about what it is that I am going to speak than I do.

Furthermore, this particular obligation forces upon me the necessity to put my words on paper and there are copies of the more formal presentation which will be available at the rear of the room at the conclusion of this session, if any of you should want to look these over. For a title to these remarks I have posed the question, simply stated:

PROFESSIONAL STATUS FOR  
STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS?

If there is any one topic which has tended to dominate the thinking, planning, and discussions of student personnel leaders during the past twenty years it is that of professional preparation and training. NASPA itself has devoted much attention to this subject and its committees and commissions have shared with groups from constituent members of the Council of Student Personnel Associations in an attempt to hammer out a statement of agreements and differences. How fruitful these discussions have been depends mainly upon your own frame of reference. My interest in this subject focuses upon a particular aspect of the larger question: namely, can we define a professional status for college and university administrators of student personnel programs?

Introduction

A program at a recent national meeting of student personnel people was entitled "Changing Patterns in Student Personnel Administration -- Are Student Personnel Administrators Necessary?" It was a stimulating program despite its failure to come to grips with the query specified in the title. It stimulated me, however, to arrange my own thoughts and convictions on the matter and to decide how I would respond were I the recipient of a direct query. I found that it was not an easy task.

My conclusion is that student personnel administrators are not necessary to the academic enterprise. They are not necessary the way that a library is essential or the way in which some senior students, usually called faculty members, are necessary. They are not necessary because their duties can be assigned to others within the academic community as in fact they are at institutions like Harvard. They are, however, useful. As long as they are useful they will persist in academia. The question is really for what are they useful?

It has now been eight years since a provocative volume by Theodore Caplow and Reece McGee entitled "The Academic Marketplace" appeared. This report of a

study in which were analyzed all professorial vacancies and replacements in the liberal arts divisions of ten universities over a period of two academic years presents in objective fashion some information which is familiar to all of us but which here for the first time was demonstrated empirically. Among the comments is this short paragraph:

"Another significant trend of the past few years has been the shift of many student-related functions from professors to nonacademic personnel in the university's 'civil service'. Student counseling is an excellent example. Once a major part of the professor's job, it has now been taken so much out of his hands that it received no single mention by any of our respondents as part of the duties of the faculty position."<sup>3</sup>

This position disturbed me greatly when I first read it and it has continued to disturb me since. It disturbs me in part because of its representation of the growing separation of teaching faculty from direct association with students. It disturbs me even more that the inheritors of this responsibility are regarded by the faculty as something less academic than they simply because of this concern for the academic progress of students. It would seem that this implies that teaching faculty are the professionals within the college and that student counselors, and student personnel administrators, are hirlings of the organization. A more polite term would be to call student personnel people bureaucrats as opposed to faculty professionals.

I think most observers of academia would agree that there has been a demonstrable change in the relationship of faculty with the employing institution. Once a professor made his way up the academic ladder as much by loyal service to the employing institution as by the techniques of research and publication. Today the professor is a highly mobile individual whose status is determined by his relationships within his discipline as much as by any other factor. Institutional orientation works against the mobility by which rapid advancement in rank and salary are obtained. An orientation toward one's discipline is the operational attitude for a faculty man on the way upward. Of course, once arrived at full professional status, some combination of these orientations would be possible but the pressures for enhanced departmental reputations and access to lucrative research contracts argue against a pervasive orientation to the employing institution.

## The Concept of a Profession

For a time there was a lively debate within student personnel work as to whether or not it was indeed a profession. Writers went back to the original statement by Abraham Flexner (1915) and analyzed student personnel work according to the six criteria he specified.<sup>6</sup> C. Gilbert Wrenn in 1949 analyzed student personnel work in terms of B. J. Horton's ten criteria (1949) and concluded that student personnel work is not a profession.<sup>15</sup> In 1959, Daniel D. Feder came

"to the conclusion that there is not now and should never be a broad professional area designated as personnel work. Rather, to do our job properly in the fields of education in which we operate, it would appear to be more appropriate to think of personnel work as part of the larger and, yet, in some ways more defined professional area of teaching."<sup>5</sup>

It was about this time, in 1958, that one of the most prolific students of the professions, Everett C. Hughes, referred to student personnel work in a slightly pejorative manner when he wrote about the growing tendency to make a profession of most work fields:

"Many people in our society work in named occupations. The names are a combination of price tag and calling card. One has only to hear casual conversation to sense how important these tags are.....Schoolteachers sometimes turn school-teaching into educational work, and the disciplining of youngsters and chaperoning of parties into personnel work.....These hedging statements in which people pick the most favorable of several possible names of their work imply an audience. And one of the most important things about any man is his audience, or his choice of the several available audiences to which he may address his claims to be someone of worth."<sup>9</sup>

## Office, Profession and Calling

There are two relevant dimensions of the field we call student personnel work. The first is concerned with the nature of the kinds of work roles which student personnel workers fill. The second has to do with the problem of career development in student personnel work and its implications for the professional aspects of those work roles. In summary I want to suggest my personal answer to the initial query -- for what purposes are student personnel

administrators useful enough to persist in the college and university of the future?

What we call student personnel work may be viewed as an office, as a profession, and as a calling. The term office implies the traditional or bureaucratic role associated with standardization of tasks, authority limited by rules and sanctions, and an emphasis upon procedures rather than goals. Student personnel administrators are employees of the college institution, and more closely related to the employers than is the typical faculty member. It is instructive that the first Dean of Men, Thomas Arkle Clark at the University of Illinois, was appointed to his position by the president in order to relieve him of certain duties which had become onerously demanding upon his time but yet could not become entirely divorced from his function as president. As personnel assigned to work with students have proliferated and specialized, we have none of us escaped this heritage. We are part of the administrative establishment, exercising authority derived from the presidential office, and in this sense we are, in the technical meaning of the term, bureaucrats.

At the same time, student personnel administrators are also responsible, independent professionals, oriented toward goals and the maintenance of standards and values. As student personnel workers have become separated physically and in communications channels from the office of the president they have been able to concern themselves with a vast and expanding body of knowledge. This has led us to emphasize educational qualifications and training experiences and has added to our tendency toward specialization. The result has been the gradual carving out of areas of authority for decision making separate from the authority of the head of the institution.

Student personnel people are also public servants and in this sense student personnel work is a calling. Service to others is put before personal profit. In this sense our image has common traits with that of the healer of the sick. It is the humanitarian and service aspects of the student personnel role which justify our categorizing it as a calling.

It is obvious that these three different identities sometimes place incompatible demands upon an incumbent. Take the matter of loyalty. As a bureaucrat one's loyalty is to the administration; as a professional to one's professional ideals and associations; as a calling one's loyalty is to the student-client. The most obvious of these conflicts is between the demands of the professional and the bureaucratic roles. I suggest that much of the insecurity

student personnel workers feel in the institutional setting is attributable directly to these conflicts.

The bureaucratic role places emphasis upon standardization, continuity, and stability. The operational representation of this is an emphasis upon files and records, upon the routine task. The professional role, in contrast, places stress on unique problems and decisions and is characterized by variety and change. We all recognize that our daily occupations contain elements of both of these roles. It is in their balance that we frame much of the judgment of our satisfaction with our positions. It is in our differential performance in these two roles that our job status is frequently judged.

A bureaucrat is employed to carry out procedures. He has less authority. His tendency is to elaborate rules and sanctions to insure predictability and hence efficiency. The professional stress is on the goals of the organization, upon the maintenance of standards and values rather than upon efficiency. Professional service is guaranteed by the special capacity to solve problems.

The two roles are thus contrasted by the different degree of authority permitted and by the relationship of the role to organizational means and goals. Each of us is aware of the confused expectations of us in terms of these roles. For example, which one of us has not had to carry out an assigned responsibility for an essential college function without facing the conflicting expectations of the chief business officer, who wants efficiency and predictability, and the dean of faculty, who wants each individual student considered in terms of his level of performance and cares little for consistent individually based service from one student to the next. And which one of us has not had to deal with the shifting moods of a president who must struggle continuously between these two conflicting expectations which also impinge upon him.

The dilemma is further complicated by the fact that both of these role concepts conflict with the traditional values of student personnel work. Listen to the words of Ronald Corwin as he discussed this point in relation to the conflict in nursing roles:

"The professional and bureaucratic conceptions, requiring as they do duties which remove the nurse from contact with patients, are largely responsible for a basic dilemma of nursing: while nurses are supposed to want contact with the patient, they are rewarded for values and skills which do not require it."<sup>4</sup>

Is this not equally true of the student personnel administrator? He is supposed to be skilled in student relationships, a counselor and adviser of individuals and groups. Yet is he not rewarded for organizational and administrative skills which he exercises in relationship with staff and at the expense of direct involvement with students?

When observers comment upon the higher education scene today they note the problems of increasing size, of the separation of faculty from direct relationships with students, of the proliferation of administrative and service personnel, and of the growing demands from students for more definition and structure in their situations so as to compensate for the insecurity of their academic identifications. Some also note that as administrative structures grow it is the pattern of organization that is related to productivity rather than the individuals who staff the structure. Peter M. Blau, a leading student of the bureaucratic organization:

1. Specialization permits the employment of many less-trained workers, thus lowering costs;
2. High specialization creates need for a complex system of coordination;
3. Effective coordination requires disciplined performance, which is a function of rules and regulations;
4. Impersonality assures the necessary detachment if efficiency is a primary criterion.<sup>2</sup>

If we grant that the conditions under which the modern institution of higher education must function demand some bureaucratic pattern of coordination, we nonetheless can operate within such a setting on professional principles. Francis and Stone concluded from a study of persons directly involved with clients within a bureaucratic structure that an ideology of service competes effectively with an emphasis upon procedure and rule making.<sup>7</sup>

What I am suggesting from this review is that for the time being we must live with this conflict of roles. We can distinguish trends toward increasing professionalization in the emphasis upon a high degree of generalized and systematic knowledge, in a primary orientation toward community interest rather than individual self-interest, and in the attempts through voluntary associations and work socialization to develop a higher degree of self-control of behavior. We



recognize some of the needs of the institutional setting to provide more of a bureaucratic pattern of coordination of services. We are able to distinguish some of the useful effects of the ideology of service to clients in controlling the bureaucratic effects upon professional functioning. Student personnel administration thus has many of the aspects of an office, a profession, and a calling. The conflicts which ensue cannot be avoided but recognizing them should help us to encompass them effectively.

Certainly, if student personnel administrators are the campus officers most sensitive to the student milieu, how is it that we have become identified in the minds of both faculty and students with that third force called administration? That we have become so identified is undeniable. We are policy implementers and we are management oriented. We carry functional responsibility and we have access to the ultimate power structure, whatever form it may take. We tend to identify with the institution as employer rather than with an academic discipline. We carry a share of the responsibility of representing the institution to the public. We are often, where students are concerned, keepers of the purse and managers of the folkways. All of these roles tend inevitably to transmit an image of us as something different from faculty and very like line administration.

If we are to reach any kind of unity on the campus we must remedy this situation. It is ironic that the faculty against whom the students historically have had to direct their efforts toward meaningful change should now be emotionally aligned with students against those who historically were most concerned about student welfare. Student personnel people came originally from the faculty. To be viewed again as faculty we would have to act like faculty. We would need to be identified with academic disciplines and be qualified in the same manner as are our teaching colleagues. We would need to be identified as research persons through publications. Most importantly we must have an identity with classroom through regular teaching involvement.

The pressures of the classroom impinge upon all faculty and all students. The reality of the schedule is such that it cannot be ignored. Administrators of all kinds can adapt to pressures by setting other things aside but the classroom encounter can never be set aside. If one is to comprehend these inconsistencies he must share them by similar involvement.



## The Problem of Career Development

One of the characteristics of affluence in a society is the increase in the number of occupations which are given some freedom to organize their work. Some of this, as Harold Wilensky has observed, is frequently nothing more than self-interest, a struggle for the rewards of exclusive jurisdiction.<sup>13</sup> Much of the political maneuvering of student personnel people in Washington, D.C., for preferred status for guidance and counseling in the Office of Education labyrinth is such self-serving struggle. What we must beware of is an involvement in bureaucratic self-advancement which makes professional expertise "the enemy of the playfulness characteristic of the intellectual" as David Reisman writes.<sup>12</sup> I suggest that this perception is at the root of much of the rejection of student personnel administrators by academicians.

If at this stage of our own professional history we have not arrived at a resolution of these conflicts, how can we presume to advise entrants into the field on their own career development? The fact is that there is not an agreed upon pattern for the career development of a student personnel administrator. The growth of a specialized body of knowledge to be mastered has led to efforts to reach agreement upon graduate educational prescriptions. Gradually we have come to recognize the relevance of various behavioral science disciplines. We accredit either graduate degrees in these substantive disciplines or degrees in schools of education whose programs draw directly and increasingly from the contributions of these disciplines. In the area of training our concerns about our differences of opinion tend to obscure the large area of basic agreement and common understanding. But when we consider career development in terms of entry worker positions and subsequent job assignments we have neither agreement nor clear pattern. In fact, we have seemingly deliberately avoided coming to grips with these questions.

Some of this unwillingness to grapple with these problems stems no doubt from the conflicts of roles which we discussed earlier. To talk seriously and meaningfully about career development would involve us with the bureaucratic elements of our tasks and this confrontation is threatening to our self-concepts. There is the warfare of the academic jungle, involvement in which threatens our professional self-definition.

A recent study of the assignment of student financial aids responsibility within the college structure led to the recommendation, unpublished as yet,

that it should be any place except in the student personnel area. There is the strange history of the administrative development of the student union movement which grew as an opponent of the student counseling area rather than as an integral part of it. These illustrations can be multiplied. The point is how would you advise a young and committed graduate student who asked your advice about a first job in the field? How would you approach the conflicts among bureaucratic, professional, and service roles in planning a career in student personnel administration?

Look at the special problem of the young woman professional. Jessie Bernard in her 1965 study entitled "Academic Women" points to the percentage of college posts in various fields which are held by women.<sup>1</sup> Student personnel positions are high on the list with 44.4% of the positions in the institutions in her study being filled by women.

But what do we observe in our placement of offices at professional meetings? We observe a large number of single, able, attractive young women seeking a variety of jobs which will permit them to gain varied experience and allow a normal social life. And what kinds of jobs are available? Literally hundreds of residence hall administration and counseling positions which give an excellent experience but deny them what they consider to be a normal social life. They tend to accept the housing residence positions as a last resort and why shouldn't they? How much better the situation would be if we recognized clearly that a housing experience was an essential part of career development but we had a fairly definite pattern of movement from this to another type of student personnel experience.

At the other end of the spectrum look for a minute at the position of Dean of Women. This is the single most difficult position for a student personnel administrator to fill when it becomes vacant in his table of organization. There are simply not enough able and trained persons to fill these positions. One of the reasons for this is that we have not thought through a career development pattern which is adapted to the special needs of women. One of these, of course, is her need to marry and fill the roles of wife and mother as well as the role of a professional person. Until we do this we shall not be able to meet readily the staffing needs of our institutions.

A young assistant dean of students calls and asks for advice concerning an offer to serve as assistant dean of a liberal arts college. What would this experience do for his professional future which he

hopes will be as a university dean of students? A young Ph.D. is considering several offers, one of which is at the institution at which he has done his graduate work and gained all of his professional experience. What would staying at this institution do for his future career growth as compared with moving to one of the other institutions which have made him similar offers? A fraternity adviser has an offer in admissions-- a residence hall director has an offer in institutional research -- a student activities adviser is asked to asked to become a union director -- an assistant registrar is invited to become an academic counselor in an academic dean's office -- where are the career pattern studies which give us guidelines to advise our younger people? [For a discussion of this in terms of professional placement, see Hulet, Richard E. "Perils of a Placement Office" in NASPA, v.3: no. 4, pp.13-15 (1966).]<sup>10</sup>

The dimensions of these needed guidelines are several: type of experiences needed, type of institution, the relationship of discipline of graduate study to advisable next steps, and the function of government and other related agency experiences to eventual senior administrative responsibility in the educational hierarchy.

Is it any wonder that we do not define clearly the positions in a student personnel career which represent achievement or arrival at peak recognition? Many of our ablest people leave the field. Some leave for teaching posts, some for other administrative assignments, some for marginal academic positions. This seems to me to be one of the greatest weaknesses for we lose most of our elder statesmen to other career identifications, a situation which seems to belittle the field as a profession, and the people in it.

### The Dimensions of Usefulness

This brings us back to the question with which we began. Student personnel administrators are not necessary, but they are useful. As long as they are useful they will persist. But useful for what?

Student personnel administrators must be first of all intellectuals, who live by ideas rather than with them. The first qualification of a student personnel administrator is that he be able to read, that he does read in preference to listening to television and attending athletic events and being a leader in the campus and community social whirl. He must be a part of the intellectual community and be identified as such rather than always the enforcer of the norms of the status quo.

The student personnel administrator should be a part of the teaching community. He must be identified with an academic discipline, function in the departmental organization, and teach actively in the classroom. He should have some part in the research of the department. I recognize that he cannot be both an effective administrator and a great teacher. My position is that the classroom experience is the one part of the campus experience which is common both to all students and to all faculty. He can scarcely appreciate the tensions and demands of that relationship unless he is a functioning part of it.

Student personnel administrators should be the most concerned persons for creating a climate which encourages and recognizes creativity. We are too often a part of the institutional straitjacket which so surrounds both students and faculty that once captured they never move intellectually freely again. This implies that in our own field we resist the drive for professionalization if it means just one path of preparation. We need to maintain a broad tolerance for the skills and understanding of all who would bring their knowledge to bear upon understanding students and their culture.

The counselor-administrator must be a climate creator. This is his preeminent task. To some this may appear to be another way of saying that he must be a manipulator of persons and of events. There is however a subtle distinction. As a climate creator he has no personal or private agenda toward the accomplishment of which he uses people and things. Instead he has an open agenda, an imperative to use all facilities open to him to re-create the unity of the university in a day when individualism is openly threatened by the demands of the society. It is this toward which students are striving, though they lack the experience to delineate it. It is this which enables the scholar to pursue his studies most effectively and the student to learn most effectively.

With presidents, chancellors and provosts preoccupied with problems of finance, structure, and public relations who else is there to play the role of climate creator? We can bemoan the change of the campus scene or we can seize the opportunity this gives us. We can make the student-teacher confrontation the central and most meaningful experience on the campus if we ourselves can be rid of that privatism and vain-glory to which all administrators are occupationally subject.

It is true that student personnel administrators have some claim to being intellectuals. We live in a period when intellectuals have newly won access

to the centers of power and opportunity and privilege. This is a seductive prospect and none of us is immune to its blandishments. This situation plus the obvious success and achievement which our positions represent makes us a part of the establishment. Do you recognize how much resentment this produces among students who fail out of college or to those who come from backgrounds which give them no reason to be confident that they can find a place in a rapidly rigidifying society?

These suggestions are of a kind which when grouped together appear to make the student personnel administrator the guardian and the transmitter of the academic tradition. It is clear that the faculty have abdicated that role, that the presidents are not free to fill it, and that the students are incapable of it. The student personnel people are in a strategic position to fill the role. In the very best sense this is a professional function. Talcott Parsons has written:

"It is one of the important facts about Western society that to a very great extent the primary institutionalized bearers of its main cultural traditions and leaders of its thought are highly professionalized groups without whose role the distinctive characteristics of cultural tradition would be very greatly altered."<sup>11</sup>

The conflicting role expectations discussed herein need not be handled in a wholly private fashion. The support of colleagues through professional associations can constitute a structural response to the problems of coping with the power structure within a given institution. It can help shape the role expectations and thereby mitigate the conflicting demands upon the individual occupant of a student personnel administrator post. Thus the need for individual and private adjustments is minimized. But, isn't this what the faculty members are doing through their disciplines? And how does this square with the imperative upon the student personnel administrator to create an open and free campus climate? The balance is for us who currently occupy these roles to establish. Ours are the same issues with which to grapple as face our faculty colleagues. Perhaps the directness with which this role conflict impinges upon us as student personnel administrators will produce a meaningful resolution for the guidance of other sub-groups in academia. It is here that student personnel administrators can be most useful.

In our time we who have made a commitment to the counseling of students and to the enhancement of the campus climate for learning have a unique opportunity to play a central role in campus development.

If we insist on our prerogatives, stand on our dignity, take offense at the student who deliberately challenges us or the faculty member who denigrates our right to be a part of an academic community, then we have lost our chance. If, however, we take our place in the classroom and share the pressures of the teaching-learning situation, learn to live between the seats of power and pressures from students and faculty without demanding power or popularity, and accept our own fallibility and dispensability, we can function in a freeing and creative manner. From where else might such leadership come? (Prolonged applause)

### Bibliography

- 1 Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964, xxv, 331 pp.
- 2 Blau, Peter M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society, New York: Random House, 1956.
- 3 Caplow, Theodore and Reece J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace, New York: Basic Books, 1958, 262 pp.
- 4 Corwin, Ronald G. "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, LSVI: 604-15 (1961).
- 5 Feder, Daniel O. "The Emerging Role of the Professional Personnel Worker," in Henry, Nelson B. (ed.), Personnel Services in Education: Fifty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- 6 Flexner, A. "Is Social Work a Profession?" School and Society, I: 901-11 (1915).
- 7 Francis, Roy G., and Robert C. Stone. Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956, vi, 201 pp.
- 8 Henry, Nelson B. (ed.) Personnel Services in Education: Fifty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- 9 Hughes, Everett C. Men and Their Work, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.
- 10 Hulet, Richard E. "Perils of a Placement Office," NASPA, v. 3, No. 4, pp. 13-14, 1966.

- 11  
Parsons, Talcott. Essays in Sociological Theory,  
(2nd edition, rev.). Glencoe, Illinois:  
Free Press, 1954, 459 pp.
- 12  
Riesman, David. Review of Richard Hofstadter's  
Anti-Intellectualism in American Life.  
American Sociological Review 28: 1038-40  
(1963).
- 13  
Wilensky, Harold L. "Mass Society and Mass Culture:  
Interdependence or Independence?" American  
Sociological Review, 29: 173-97 (1964).
- 14  
Williamson, E. G. (ed.). Trends in Student Personnel  
Work, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota  
Press, 1949.
- 15  
Wrenn, C. Gilbert, "An Appraisal of the Professional  
Status of Student Personnel Work, Part I,"  
in Williamson, E. G. (ed.) Trends in Student  
Personnel Work, Minneapolis: University of  
Minnesota Press, 1949.

DR. PHILLIP TRIPP (Research Specialist,  
Bureau of Higher Education, United States Office of  
Education, Washington, D. C.): First, let me express  
appreciation for the invitation to comment on Presi-  
dent Glen's speech.

As I prepared my remarks, a Shakespearian  
aphorism "how sharper than a serpent's tooth, a  
thankless child," kept coming to mind. I am not Glen's  
child, but I have been his friend for a number of years  
and he has been most helpful in persuading Uncle Sam to  
finance a trip to Seattle on this occasion; and I hope  
what I am about to say in no way alters our previous  
happy relationship. (Laughter)

The paper under discussion is a vital and  
important one for it reports one of our self images  
not only to ourselves but to the academic community  
generally. It is an example of Robert Merton's con-  
cept of the self-fulfilling prophecy at work. There-  
fore it must be dealt with seriously and reflectively.

Nonetheless it somehow reminds me of one of  
the current Polak stories making the rounds. Do you  
know why Polaks have hunched shoulders and sloping  
foreheads? When they are asked questions, they always  
go [hunching shoulders], and when they hear the cor-  
rect answers, they always go [hitting forehead with  
palm of hand]. (Laughter) So it seems too often we  
reply to the question of professional status of the  
work in which we are engaged in this way. (Laughter)



President Glen's remarks are thoughtful, analytical, perceptive of current realities, probably correct for this time and this place; but they are also ultraconservative, even atavistic in their thrust; and if they are correct for the long run, I should forecast that student personnel administration will not long be merely useful but that it will disappear as a form of academic work. It will be moved to a para-academic technical level and lose its present pressure and form.

In some respects the picture drawn is a consummation devoutly to be wished, for it so neatly solves all of the really pressing problems that beset this zone of academic life. It is suggested basically that we acquiesce to the allegations that our work has no legitimate disciplinary bases and that we return to earlier solutions by identifying ourselves as members of the traditional professoriate who also happen to be interested in a specialized form of administration pertaining to students. As the French say chacun a son gout -- every man to his taste. Certainly this is a popular view and one I believe to be widely held among the brethren. No small wonder. Our recently completed study at the U. S. Office of Education of student services administration in the United States suggests that a majority of the men and women in the top administrative positions came this route into their present positions. This is also true of about half the Deans of Men who report to them.

But I submit to you that in terms of present needs and present understandings of our work, and the expectations that have been laid upon it by the rest of the world, the avocational postgraduate method of professional development is too great a luxury and in some cases too chancy to be afforded in the years ahead. It is a saber-tooth curriculum in the space age.

To coin a phrase, this is an age of incredible social change. (Laughter) The groves of the academy are being tended by new husbandmen, to wit: us, some of us with reluctance. The old caretakers have found movement among various groves and talking to other caretakers of similar bent more attractive, in many instances, than the old tasks of building communitas in the Greek sense.

The lot has fallen to us to be principals in the performance of this task. It is a difficult, even onerous task, for it involves changing old modes of behavior, testing new hypotheses, bringing to bear new knowledge on old situations which, though inefficient, have the comfortableness of long usage on their side. The notion of being the agents of



social change is a little chilling -- even frightening-- in so conservative a society as ours. We like to talk about it, but we do not like to be involved in it. Yet we are principals among those who have this charge. This is noted in some detail in President Glen's analysis. I quote:

"The counselor-administrator must be a climate creator. This is his preeminent task. To some this may appear to be another way of saying that he must be a manipulator of persons and of events. There is however a subtle distinction. As a climate creator he has no personal or private agenda toward the accomplishment of which he uses people and things. Instead he has an open agenda, an imperative to use all facilities open to him to re-create the unity of the university in a day when individualism is openly threatened by the demands of the society. It is this toward which students are striving, though they lack the experience to delineate it."

And in his summary remarks he said:

"In our time we who have made a commitment to the counseling of students and to the enhancement of the campus climate for learning have a unique opportunity to play a central role in campus development."

Central to this observation is the notion that we are practicing humanists and social scientists who must be more than passingly familiar with fundamental ideas and techniques from such demanding disciplines as philosophy, anthropology, psychology and political science. In addition, we must possess or develop a whole new corpus of technical and theoretical materials of our own. We have the exquisite opportunity to try to effect a significant change, hopefully for the better, in the lives of all who inhabit our dwelling place. This is not work to be taken lightly, nor is it susceptible of treatment by avocationalists. This work takes skill, scholarship and savvy of a new order and magnitude.

We must be administrators -- sure -- but a new breed of administrators who use structure not to reinforce the status quo, but rather for propaedeutic ends that promote social growth. What a revolutionary opportunity that is! We surely must be teachers -- but a new and different kind of teachers who are justified in teaching not necessarily or exclusively by sharing the traditional classroom instructional function. Rather it is our challenge and opportunity to take the exciting materials of uncertain and cloudy characteristics, often originating in controversy and dissatisfaction, and to turn them to maturing

experiences for those in our tutelage, and hopefully for ourselves as well.

Sometimes the classroom will be in the conference room, or in other unorthodox places such as jails, the settlement houses, or our outer lobbies.

Certainly we share an obligation to conduct research. Although we will always draw heavily on theoretical disciplines, as an applied social science we have our own peculiar research problems which require specialized knowledge and skill. The Williamson-Cowan study is a case in point. Equally important, we must continuously examine our philosophical bases. We in the NASPA Division of Research and Publications have certainly become aware of the fact this year as we laid out the parameters of the research concerns and needs in this work.

We have a long way to go. Perhaps we are in a developmental state similar to that of psychology at the turn of the century. But we cannot respond to present requirements and possibilities by turning the clock off. The times will not permit it.

As my four year old son Merrill observed the other day, "Stuff happens." (Laughter) Stuff is happening all around us. (Laughter)

The main thrust of our long-time concern -- the student and the community -- are at stage center now. We have the opportunity to demonstrate the legitimacy of our place in the temple of Athena. We have not only the opportunity but the obligation to bring to bear all the competencies developed through years of devoted work by each of you in the main task of reorganizing and restructuring our world to achieve the goal of what President Leggett called our first job -- to be human and then more human in the best sense of the word. I submit that we have indeed a claim to the accolade -- professional.

Thank you. (Applause)

DEAN MIRIAM A. SHELLEN (Dean of Women, University of Illinois): Gentlemen and Ladies: I will thank Dr. Nygreen now for his more than kind invitation last night.

I also would accuse Tom Emmet of playing a Machiavellian role, but I know that I am a substitute for Catherine Northup of Washington State, who was unable to be here. You see, Glen prepared, he told me, for this day by reading his horoscope. I did not

get around to reading the paper this morning, so I do not know what the stars forecast for me.

After Dr. Nygreen's eloquent presentation and the confrontation of Phil Tripp, I will go back to my early days at Berea College. I too started out in teaching. Berea, as you know, is a college for mountain students. They took on the task of debating the New York University debating team. When a mountain boy was somewhat bested by his highly verbal city slicker opponent, he gave his clinching argument, for which the New York University boy was absolutely speechless. This was his concluding argument -- by the way, they were talking about the powers of the President -- "If the Lord meant for the President to have more power He would have given it to him."  
(Laughter)

Now, I shall reset my stage a bit and continue Act 2 of this dialog. As you know, when actors read excerpts from plays, they give the setting of the previous acts. I should tell you that after the last NASPA convention, if you were not here, Dr. Nygreen reacted to my position paper. Now we reverse our roles.

First, let me reset my stage and define my position. I think student personnel work is a profession, within the broad field of education itself. It is an emerging profession. It has a body of knowledge as does an applied science, and it is researchable. It has a code of ethics, albeit not yet clearly set forth, but if we do not operate under a code of ethics who are we to teach moral values, to set climates of learning, to be that person who sets the young person's directions?

If I read Dr. Nygreen's paper correctly, in the late night and in the early morning light, he says we are dispensable. Well, in this day of self-study, of independent research and the like for our students, we could also say faculty are dispensable. If I were to quote Dr. Nygreen out of context, or even repeat the quote by Dan Feder, who unequivocally says that student personnel work is not now nor ever will be a profession, I would be somewhat alarmed.

If student personnel work is not a profession, are we willing to settle for a job?

Role concepts, as viewed by others, give faculty headaches too, or conflicts if you would rather call it that. Witness "Publish or Perish," "Teaching Research and Service, The Three Arms of the University."

Faculty roles are changing just as our roles are changing, but I think Dr. Nygreen did come to the dilemma which faces us. I quote: "He is skilled in student relationships, a counselor and adviser of individuals and groups. Yet he is rewarded for organizational and administrative skills which he exercises in relationship with staff and at the expense of direct involvement with students." This I think is any person's dilemma in the present university.

It requires a restructuring of the pattern of higher education to meet the needs of students, first, and those of staff. We need more study of the ways to deal with mass society, and urbanization, translated to size and complexity in the university.

I continue, and quote out of context: "We tend to identify with the institution as employer." I think this is a true statement. The second one led me astray, "rather than with an academic discipline." I would prefer to say, "rather than with the student."

It seems to me our academic discipline is the study of the student in the collegiate environment. We join the faculty through our roles as informal teachers. We try to help the student put together the parts into the whole. Here I think Dr. Nygreen and I differ most clearly. I do not think we must come from faculty origins, even though I and many of you did. I have the feeling that this argument is a little like that of an indignant mother who said to me one day, "How can you possibly understand my daughter. You've never been a mother." She was in fact saying, there is no body of knowledge only experience that each generation must repeat for itself.

If to be acceptable we must join the faculty formally, then I will say, "Give up; you're going down the wrong road." That quotation came from a British young man who had been extolling the close academic community of his college of 500. When asked what advice he had for those of us from institutions of 28,000, he said simply, "Give up; you're going down the wrong road." (Laughter)

To continue, Dr. Nygreen presents the problem of career development. It is a problem, especially if we say it is not a career but a job, and then say that this is how you become a professional. Do we play it cautious, and follow the tradition of faculty first? May I remind you that the first doctors were barbers. (Laughter) Sorry, Glen. The knife was there. (Laughter)

To young men I would say, develop your body

of knowledge of the student and of the institution. Work at job skills wherever they are in the university. Know that you can move horizontally as well as vertically. And keep learning, studying fundamentals and concepts, more than how to do it.

I would say in this day apprentice training is a wasteful method of basic teaching, because without a mentor we tend to settle into skills training rather than concepts. I would say we need to find the common elements in student personnel work and then we can move from one position to another.

To young women and those who teach, work with and employ them, I would say, take a long view of their lives and especially note the timing of a woman's career may be different from that of a man's.

Lastly, I would agree with Dr. Nygreen that we must live by ideas and not with them, but I maintain there are ways of exercising our intellects outside the formal classroom. I would agree that we are climatologists, setting the climate for inquiry and creativity. But the President-Elect, Ed Williamson, said, "We must be agents of change." In other words, we must teach students to channel creativity into productivity, just as every artist must develop his creativity into some result.

In a sense, I think Dr. Nygreen is pleading for the educated man in the institution, formerly held by the faculty. Now the faculty are discipline oriented. We need this, what I think we should call the liberally educated man, and we perhaps now perform this role of putting together the parts. I would say that we use the applied science of student personnel work as a vehicle of teaching the basic humanities, and then I would conclude by saying, as did another writer, that if we do our jobs well this will not be the age of automation and technology, but it will be the age of the person. Thank you. (Applause)

DEAN ROBERT SHAFFER (Dean of Students, Indiana University): It is my job to serve as clean-up, fill in, garbage can Rollo of this panel. I agreed with the previous speakers that I would say nothing if the time went out, if the coffee was ready. I would say something brilliant and scintillating if they fell down flatly. I do not know what other agreements I had.

I am a poor man for this role, incidentally, for being a person who is slow and awkward I am not really the clean-up batter that the coach would ordinarily choose. However, it is a privilege to appear

on here and follow my good friends, and I am sure we will continue as friends. I cannot help being somewhat defensive. As some of you have known, I have had some interest in management as a science -- I hold the rank of Professor of Business Administration. So the first point I want to make, and you can all go argue among yourselves -- one good friend in the audience has already argued with me about it -- we seem to have an unexpressed and underlying prejudice toward administrators. Gentlemen, go look in the mirror. (Laughter) If you are going to get your security out of it by denying what you are, then again I would urge you to talk with a counselor or one of these other professionals on the staff (laughter), because my own feeling is that -- remember, the title of the talk was "The Professional Status for Student Personnel Administrators," and I would claim, in my defensive way, I am not at all of this French speaking literati, educated people -- I was claiming that they evaded or avoided that topic and spoke about student personnel work, or student personnel services.

I am not against this. I make a little bit of my money in this way too, and that is fine, but we are talking about student personnel administration. So, number one, do not leave with the thought that you are not an administrator. I know some of you argue with this, and that is good. That is one of the reasons for the convention.

Secondly, if we are going to get our status and security in clearly defined roles, and eliminate all role conflicts, again I think, as Dean Sheldon said, we are in the wrong field. We are not hired to get our security this way. I would differ then with Glen in defining only teaching as in the stable classroom situation.

I am going to move fast on this, and I would therefore say, as I would judge about every person in this room who does want to get satisfaction from this teaching, to get his satisfaction from that informal teaching which comes along with staff development, whether it be professional staff development of your own staffs (which I am going to speak to in a moment), or your staff development which is implied in your working with students and student leaders in the extra-class situation.

In 1937 it was defined as creative staff management, creative staff leadership, whatever you want, but I would claim that if we are getting a feeling of insecurity and lack of reward as administrators, it may be because we see ourselves as expeditors, finalizers, getting things done, period, instead of seeing ourselves as this staff leader, teacher of our staff, and

get our rewards out of seeing these people develop and do the job that we are hired to administer.

Again, I just have to raise the question because we cannot develop it at great length, but the secret of course to our mental health, as well as to the success of our work is this continuous personal and professional development that comes by working with a staff in such a way that each staff member has a feeling of continuous personal and professional development.

Anyone of us who thinks of administration in this day and age -- whether it be in business, public administration, government, or whether it be in education -- as administering something, or whether you define the assigned duties and put them all in pigeon-holes and walk out of the room, just has an outmoded concept of administration that went out in 1910. People did not know it maybe, but it is certainly not applicable to the 1960's. Well, administrators are human, they have feeling. How would you like to be, let us say, and employee of American Motors with a new chief executive officer, whose first public statement was, "I don't like anything I see." (Laughter) How would you like to work with him?

He will do the job. He has done the job many places. I think already sales have gone up in the last month in his enterprise. It can be done. But it can not be done if the administrator sees his job as holding down others and putting them in a pigeonhole.

I think that is where our educational colleagues react to us, and have this prejudice toward the bureaucrat terminology. There is nothing wrong with being hirelings, to use Glen's tinged word, bureaucrats, administrators. Well, I think I made that point.

My third point is, of course, we are dispensable. The only reason we have conventions is to get off the campus so we can learn that we are dispensable. We have mental hygiene. When you begin to think that you are indispensable take a vacation or get off the campus. (Laughter)

Again I would challenge us, that our work may not be dispensable, though the form of it is, as evidenced by the history of mankind, and even in our own lives, the history of management organizations. But we as individuals are dispensable, and the world will go on if we do not, and it will. I hope that as we work with these young people that our challenges, and our irritants, our pride and our joy and our sorrows, that we know that we are working with something

that is going on, and that we do not feel that, my goodness, if I am dispensable therefore I am insecure and I must build up a wall around me or something and become defensive, compensatory, in my behavior.

My very last point: People who live by ideas are disturbed. How can you have an idea in the modern world and not be disturbed? So therefore, again, if we are to consider that those of us who have the difficult task of managing both an environment or climate of ideas -- I am using management now in what I claim as an acceptable term. Some of you will reject that, but just think about it. But this is our job, and in a world which tends to reject ideas, but needs it (the spiritual concepts related to the ideas) more than ever before, then we had better be disturbed.

I would be sorry for a group of student personnel workers, certainly student personnel administrators to meet in today's society, wherever they are, Seattle, Washington, Atlanta, or wherever they are, and not be disturbed. Let us not equate however disturbance and concern with a feeling of failure or frustration. Obviously we are frustrated. We wish we knew the answers to whether it would be race relations, sexual relations, war in Viet Nam, taxes, urban redevelopment. As we rode in from the airport it took an hour to go eleven miles. There are a lot of things that would disturb us. (Laughter) Let us not relate that disturbance with our personal equanimity which is required to do the job that we have.

As I say, the reward of doing our job well will be more frustration, more disturbance, but I hope a mental equanimity that will mean that we will be able to meet the changes in the future under the leadership of people like you heard speak here this morning. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMSON: Fellow Bureaucrats: (Laughter) At the risk of keeping the coffee a little delayed, and perhaps a little cooler, Glen is entitled to destroy all these criticisms by rebuttal. Glen, this is your day.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Ed, and thank you, my friends. I would like coffee, and so we will be there shortly.

I feel as though I ought to deliver an elementary lecture in the sociology of institutions. (Laughter) Stuff happens, but institutions persist. We may say that we would like to remake the academic world according to a blueprint we define, but we must deal with the institution of academia as it is, with



people as they are conditioned, with their strivings and their frustrations, and their competitiveness, and all the rest.

I do agree with Dean Sheldon that we must restore the centrality of the student. My point is that I think student personnel administrators are the critical people to do this, but that we cannot do it by ourselves, that we can not do it apart from the faculty, and that if you cannot lick them, join them, and let us find a way by which we can put the student back into the center of the campus culture, with the faculty operating or doing it.

I would comment upon what Phil Tripp said by pointing out that there have been a number of attempts -- and I will not take the time to delineate them; you know them as well as I do -- by academic self-interests to attempt to take over or to dominate or spread eagle the field of what we now call student personnel administration. The demands of the marketplace have defeated all of these. It does not mean that they were wrong, or misdirected or anything of that sort. They were not. They were very well thought through and very well done.

I am saying that in addition to the persistence of institutions that we must recognize the realities of the marketplace, the kinds of institutions that are building, the changing relationships between the graduate school and the undergraduate schools, and we must recognize that we will staff our organizations with people who come from a variety of backgrounds. I would exclude none. I would, of course, with all my colleagues here, recognize the central importance of the growing body of research knowledge which comes from the behavioral sciences.

I did not say that classroom teaching was the only teaching. I say that classroom teaching and learning experiences were the common experience of all faculty and all students on the campus. Yes, informal teaching must be that in which we are primarily engaged. I am simply calling for the restoration of the sense of community to which we have all referred, by our seeing ourselves centrally as educators.

Yes, we are bureaucrats, but we are other things. Like Bob Shaffer's eloquent statement, I firmly believe that only when the campus is at its most anxious, excited, disturbed, even frenetic, does the most significant education go on. I would point out that a calm, quiet campus, in which the administrator for student affairs can get the pat on the back from the President, and the Chairman of the Board of

Trustees because they have not had any really upsetting problems to deal with and no outbreaks in the legislatures or boards, is not a campus worth attending.

I am simply saying that we do not want to view ourselves as controllers, lid sitters, managers. We must be educators, and a part of that says we must get our inner security helping people learn to grapple with ideas, to distinguish among the alternatives available for them for choices, and learning to make logical choices. The habits of logical choice, or logical thought and integrity in thought and action, these are the goals which we seek.

With this, I simply respond again to my friends here to say that we will be arguing these things probably as long as we come to NASPA meetings, helping each other to clear out his own thinking. I hope what we have said to you today helps you to get into some corridor arguments of your own.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMSON: I took an undergraduate course in physiological psychology and I learned that one of the criteria by which you identify living tissue was the capacity for irritability. I am sure you will agree with me that this panel, in supplementing Glen, has opened this convention with irritation as the motto and the goal.

Before you turn to coffee, Tom has some words of wisdom.

... Conference announcements ...

... The Second General Session recessed at ten-thirty o'clock ...

THIRD GENERAL SESSION  
Monday - June 27, 1966

The Third General Session convened at eleven o'clock, Dean Arthur E. McCartan, Dean of Men, Washington State University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTAN: Would you please be seated. It is good to see the free spirit and independence of student personnel administrators. (Laughter)

The evaluation forms are being distributed, and they should be completed and returned to Dean Root before you leave the room. Those of you who failed to complete an evaluation form for the last session, please do so.

The Third General Session will please come to order.

The man I have the privilege to introduce to you this morning, the Reverend Andrew Greeley, is a young man who has earned a reputation in research and writing, not only within the intellectual circles of the Catholic church, but also among the foremost sociologists of the country. He is currently senior study director of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. He is also lecturer in the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and consultant, Office of Urban Affairs, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

His membership on the editorial board of Sociological Analysis, and on the Hazen Foundation Commission on "The Student in Higher Education" are only a few of several additional activities. The seven books Father Greeley has authored, from 1959 to 1966, reveal his interest and competence in problems of education, youth and the church.

Commenting on his recent research in writing on parochial education one reviewer said that the presence of Andrew Greeley at the center of the Catholic debate is well known. He has in this and other areas, as social scientists say, been highly visible.

My initial interest in Father Greeley's interest, as with many of you, was with the publication of his "New Breed" article in the American Magazine of 1964. The response this article aroused, and Father Greeley's subsequent articles on the new breed, had held interest to him and has aroused controversy, and most important has developed insight in many educators about modern youth.

Father Greeley's reasoned appraisal of the modern student, I think, has been overshadowed by the more sensationalistic Berkeley, the new left, LSD, and Parsons College. (Laughter)

We might say that Father Greeley's work has provided illumination at a time when much writing about youth provides only heat. An editor commenting recently on an article by Father Greeley states that once again he has reaffirmed his confidence in youth. He expects that they, like their parents before them, will settle down, but they will never forget how to dream the dreams of youth.

To illustrate how alert and progressive and ongoing we must be to keep up with our speaker, let me point out that as I introduce Father Greeley to discuss "The New Breed Comes to College," the June 4th, 1966 edition of American Magazine features an article by him entitled "A Farewell to the New Breed." (Laughter) You have already missed the next exciting chapter. (Laughter)

It is my pleasure to introduce the Reverend Andrew Greeley. (Applause)

REVEREND ANDREW GREELEY (Senior Study Director, National Opinion, Research Corporation, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois): Last year about this time I had the privilege of appearing before you on one of the panels as a reactor to Dean Williamson's report. As you remember, at that time you were meeting in the nation's Capitol, simultaneously with District 50 of the United Mine Workers of America. I remarked that it seemed to be an interesting commentary on American society that you could not tell the difference between the deans and the miners.

I want to go on record today as saying that it is very easy to tell the difference between the deans and the lady airplane pilots who are meeting here. (Laughter) None of the lady pilots wear Roman collars. (Laughter)

I also note with pleasure, as they say, that your former leader, Father Yanitelli, has been promoted to the role of college president. In sociology we call this sort of thing "upward mobility." The new breed, about whom I am going to speak this morning, despite the fact that I bid them farewell a month ago, would perhaps have another name for such a change in status. As I shall remark, the college administrators, in the point of view of most students, are villains, and a dean is kind of a minor villain, and a president is sort of a major villain. So with the

marvelous ability of young people to turn nouns into intransitive verbs, they would describe Father Yanitel-li's promotion by saying that he "finked out" on them. (Laughter) This morning he does not have equal time to reply. (Laughter)

#### THE NEW BREED COMES TO COLLEGE

It is my purpose this morning to comment on some more generalized aspects of the behavior of young Americans of college age. I shall strive to speak principally of the vast majority of collegians and to overcome the temptation to confuse the articulate and attention getting minority with that which is "typical," or "average," or "ordinary."

Given the nature of our present knowledge of the phenomenon in question, anybody's commentary is bound to be a highly personal one. I should detail in the beginning the three rather different perspectives which are responsible for my own viewpoint.

First of all, I spent a long decade being a "teen-age priest." I was a teen-age priest for the Vatican, so to speak. (Laughter) Since an assistant pastor is someone virtually without authority or power it is easier for him than for most adults to become part of the adolescent youth culture, especially if (a) he never had a teen-age of his own, (b) his own emotional maturity is not beyond that of a teenager, and (c) his social status within the Catholic Church in his own particular parish is little more, and oft-times less than that of the chronological adolescent. [In my early years as a priest, the Chicago Archdiocese had a rule which forbade ownership of automobiles to priests who were ordained less than five years. Like so many other rules, no one quite understood the reason for this one but it was a rule and at that stage in the history of the Catholic Church rules were seldom if ever changed. Finally, a priest came to our parish who was in the approved years and did own a car of his own. In addition, this gentleman (Lord rest his great soul) was also kind enough to let me use his car whenever I needed it. Therefore, shortly after his arrival I proceeded to drive it down one of the streets of the community and, without realizing it, in the approved adolescent fashion showing off my new toy to all my new playmates. I was caught up short when one commented to me, "Well, Father, you're at last 'in.' You now have the same rights as any sixteen year old in this parish." (Laughter)]

So at least for a part of my years I was, to a greater extent than most people, part of the late adolescent youth culture. Whether this was a regression

or a fixation, and the extent to which I have escaped from it, I leave to the judgment of those who are with me the next time I order a milk shake and French fries for lunch. (Laughter) In these, my declining years however, the role has been transmuted to one of a weekend bargain basement psychological counselor.

My second perspective is that of a survey research sociologist who has been engaged in one way or another for the last five years in a statistical study of the 1961 and more recently 1964 college graduation class.

The third perspective is that of the sociologist who, at least for the space of six glorious but exhausting months, had discarded the slide rule, the computer, and the tab sheet for a Grand Tour of thirty-six American higher educational institutions interviewing hundreds of faculty, students, and administrators at this frighteningly and marvelously diverse sample of schools.

With these perspectives in mind, let me say by way of preliminary note, that one of the main difficulties in talking about American college students today is that we are all to some extent captives of the journalists. The journalist from the nature of his profession tends to deal with that which is news (whether he be writing for the New Republic or for Time), and that which is news is oftentimes that which is deviant. Thus, the students who gain the headlines are the members of the SDS, YAF, the Peace Corps volunteers, or those who take trips on LSD, or protest United States involvement in Vietnam. I am sure you would be the last ones to deny the importance of creative minorities; they give tone and style to a whole generation, and may shape the future of society much more than the noninvolved masses ever could. In addition, they often symbolize, albeit in caricature, the problems of a generation. But, by definition, the creative minorities are not typical and if we strive to understand a generation of college students by only focusing on the creative minorities, we shall deceive ourselves. As one of my colleagues in the NORC study of college graduates comments, "The vast majority of the kids are clods." The judgment is too harsh perhaps but the point is well taken.

I will contend in this paper that the most useful concept to explain the college student, be he a member of the cloddish majority or the creative minority, is the concept of alienation. I do not use the word in the strict sense of being mentally sick or being what Kenneth Kenniston has called, the "dropouts of society." Alienation does not necessarily involve

academic underachievement, much less frequent trips on LSD. The essential element of the phenomenon of contemporary youth is that they find it increasingly difficult, if not impossible to find meaning in their work and life, and that therefore their major life satisfactions come from the relational realms of modern industrial society. One's work, and one's political and economic involvement are something that one must do without hope of obtaining meaning or satisfaction in them even though they may not be terribly burdensome either. One's happiness, however, comes more from one's family, one's personal friends, one's recreational activities, and perhaps, but only perhaps, from one's religion.

I would isolate nine elements of this meaninglessness which a young person observes in major areas of his life. First of all, he is a privatist. What Kenniston says of the young professional is true of all young Americans of college age. "The gap between his public self and his private self is very great. Publicly his goals are intellectual performance, the acquisition of expertise, making the academic grades. Thus, he is a serious, unfrivolous and quite humorless student but privately he is often very different, but one of the peculiar characteristics about the quest for intellectual competence and professional expertise is that obtaining these goals helps a little in defining the ultimate aims of existence." And Kenniston adds, with I think remarkable insight, "The divorce of public from private reflect all too faithfully the demands of our technological society that expects of its responsible students extraordinary objectivity in personality, competence, control, and efficiency but deprives public life of private commitment, idealism, passion, zeal, indignation and feeling. What matters most to students is not that they do not know their professors but they find it hard to integrate their private search for meaning with their public quest for competence."

At the root of this, of course, is the failure of the meaning giving inspiration in society. The traditional Western notions of how one achieves happiness in life satisfactions may be still relevant for the essentially *gemeinschaft* relationships of family and friendship group. The *gemeinschaft* meanings have little relevance in the highly technical, formalized, rationalized, computerized *gesellschaft* economic and political society. Indeed, philosophy, religion, poetry and prophesy, far from attempting to find meaning in the secularized *gesellschaft* society has content itself with vegetative criticism of the society and nostalgic dreams of the joys of the bucolic past, recollections which it may in part at least explain

the massive exodus from the central cities. I suspect that one of the reasons for the great popularity of Harvey Cox's volume The Secular City is that it does make the claim that meaning and significance can be found not only in the private interests of one's life in its major public commitment. Nevertheless, most meaning given agencies have clearly failed and young people have every reason to expect from that which they see around them and that which they are told, that they will obtain relatively little in the way of human satisfactions from their public activity.

In such circumstances, individuals like the late President Kennedy with driving ambition for power and responsibility in the public sphere are few and far between; the late president may indeed have been a hero to the new breed but at least in his drive for responsibility and leadership, he was anything but typical. Young people assume the opposite stance, there is neither a reason or hope of satisfaction to be found in too strong a commitment of one's person and one's emotions to the complicated world beyond the interpersonal.

Secondly, the new breeder tends to be non-ideological, to planning, to distrust all politicians and dogmatists in political matters. "They start not from the desire to reform society as an improvement for the future but from personal or existentialist statement. It is paradoxical then for a generation whose most publicized members are often termed social activists a broader social scene rarely exists as a clearly defined or sharply articulated entity."

It seems to me that Kenniston's indictment is true, indeed especially true of the new leftists who have claimed to have resurrected ideology. One merely reads the Port Huron statement of the SDS which the young leftists view almost as their Communist Manifesto to realize how ideologically bankrupt the new left really is. The Port Huron statement, at least from the point of any meaning that ideology has had in the past, is a meaningless collection of poorly written cliches and I realize that I risk the anger of the SDS for so describing what they think to be heroic prose.

There is much rejoicing among the young new leftists that Daniel Bell was wrong when he announced the end of ideology and they point to their own involvement in activities as a sign that ideology has been reborn. But Bell did not announce the end of radicalism or extremism or social demonstration much less of bizarre human behavior. He simply reported that ideology, at least in any sense of the word that



it has normally had, seemed to be vanishing from the scene and I see no evidence in contemporary activity of the new leftists that Bell was wrong.

We hear little if any trenchant, hard headed criticism based on careful, incisive analysis of society and coupled with clear and detailed programs for its reform. We rather hear wild generalizations based on agony and disgust, documented, for the most part, only by quotations from C. Wright Mills who, whatever his merits as a sociological thinker, can surely not be described as a careful analyst of social problems.

The new left leaves us no doubt that they do not like contemporary society though they are hard put to articulate too clearly in terms other than the wildly rhetorical what it is they do not like. But surely they have not been able to present us with any model for the restructuring of society nor any goals other than immediately organizational ones. One often has the impression that campus protests are put together for the sheer joy of exercising power, almost as an end in themselves. Make no mistake about it, the young leftists are superb organizers but oftentimes it would seem that their organized activities are merely an occasion to vent their displeasure with adults and with authority figures and not as part of any carefully thought-out plan for social reform. Indeed at the present time the only really new ideologists to be found on the scene are the Black Nationalists. While people disagree with their philosophy, it is clear what their philosophy is and what they stand for. Of their brothers on the new left, I do not think this can be said.

If a young man informs us that all the ideology one needs is the ideology of love he may indeed be engaging in existentialist emoting but he is not giving a coherent plan for the reform of society. Kenniston's words are important not only of the new leftists but of all young Americans. "Without a clear specification of what is good and what is bad about American society coupled with a coherent ideology of social reform, few individuals can sustain for long the mis- haps and disappointments which afflict those who seek to improve society. The model of personal demonstration by itself is not likely to endure. Two hours a week in a slum area, two months in Mississippi during a summer, or two years in Afghanistan with the Peace Corps will serve to dissipate rather than confirm the student's activism. Once he's demonstrated where he stands there is little further need for improvement. The demonstration has been made, his impulses have been exhausted, and he can resume his course up the academic stepladder, putting aside all thoughts of social reform for the interest in a Ph.D., a professional job, and the rich, full life."

Kenniston notes somewhere else in this article which I have been quoting, that the demonstrations seem to end at exam times because, while of course it is important that one protests, one must not let the protest interfere with one's grade point average.

Again, we see of course the meaninglessness at work. The new breeder precisely does not have an ideology. He is anti-ideological because there is no coherent ideology around that he finds useful to analyze or to explain the confusion he sees in society.

Thirdly, the new breeder is profoundly personalist. As a member of the psychological generation he is deeply concerned about human personality. He knows all the jargon and theories of psychiatry (without of course really understanding them) and he is capable of applying these theories to human behavior and especially to his own behavior. He is worried about his personality development, and agonizes over whether indeed he has a normal and healthy personality. If you really have despaired of finding satisfaction in the public sector of your life then you will be intensely concerned about the private sector, and indeed be given to sustained and, on occasion, neurotic examination of your abilities and potencies (sexual or otherwise) in the world of human relations.

The members of the new breed, unless they be seriously and intellectually concerned, have probably not read Kierkegaard, Kafka, Freud, or Camus. Nonetheless, these four men, particularly the gloomy Dane who looked out of his window into the rainy streets of Copenhagen and agonized over his soul, have had an immense influence over contemporary young people. Nor is this necessarily bad.

It is quite likely that the tremendous personalist concern of the present generation of young Americans may mark a major cultural leap forward as the dignity and the value of the human personality becomes in practice as well as in theory the most important norm regulating human society. This great leap forward is of tremendous importance though the disaffiliation of a generation of young people from the public sector of life may be too high a price to pay for it.

Fourthly, the new breed is skeptical about organizations, indeed skeptical about them to the point of paranoia. Such skepticism is not at all surprising in view of what has already been said. Public life, where there is little satisfaction or ultimate meaning, is highly organized. Private life, where there is love and affection and meaning, tends

to be unorganized. Therefore, organization is bad and lack of organization is good. Anything that is organized -- be it the presumed establishment that runs our country or the college which one attends -- represents the forces of evil, and is a convenient scapegoat for explaining one's frustrations and disenchantments. The college president and dean, as the embodiment of the organization and the establishment, is a convenient "monster" on which all one's ills can be blamed, particularly since the younger members of the social science faculty provide a class conflict jargon for such scapegoating.

You see, they have sold out. They have gotten their Ph.D., but by maintaining a class conflict pose they are able to reassure themselves that somehow or another that the getting in the "publish or perish" rat race is not really a sell out. By the time they are full professors the students will look on them as finks too. (Laughter)

The journey from being a Trotskyite to being a full professor took about twenty years, for the old left. My observation of the new left is that they can make it in less than ten.

I would be the first to concede that skepticism of organizations in general and college administrations in particular is not totally irrational. But it must be seen in context as part of a despair the young person feels over having any influence on, or major satisfaction from the organized society. They may well be prepared to admit that man can have no influence in a larger society without organization but once you have abandoned any hope of having such influence, organization does not appear to have much point to it except wherever it becomes absolutely necessary for one's existence. That organizations may provide an atmosphere and a climate in which in the sharing of resources people may develop their skills and potentialities is a proposition to which there may be some theoretical assents but no practical agreement.

Fifthly, the present generation of students would seem to me to be consciously and avowedly anti-traditionalists. It is the past with its traditional wisdom that has produced the organized society to which one must be committed and from which one gains more beyond some professional satisfactions and the financial resources necessary for the rich, full life. If the past produced the meaninglessness of public society there is surely no reason why the young person should expect to find guidance from the past. Previous generations have made a thoroughgoing mess out of human existence; with the exception of the activists, the

new generation does not propose to undo the mess but neither does it feel in any sense bound to look to the makers of the mess for guidance and wisdom. The new leftists who muttered at Berkeley that one can't trust anyone over thirty (one supposes with the exception of Hal Draper) spoke for his whole generation. This is of course a madly undifferentiated view of reality which contends that you reject the whole of the past because of the mistakes the past has made. The new left, for example, has already produced its Wittacker Chambers and given half a chance will probably produce its Joseph McCarthy, too. I hope he is not Catholic this time. (Laughter) It would be ideal if he were Jewish, but I don't think that will happen either. (Laughter)

Every generation has been greatly skeptical of its predecessors, but it's my impression that the present one excels all past generations in its skepticism, at least in part because its predecessors have handed on to them everything but a coherent view of the meaning of human existence.

Sixthly, there is among the new breed a strong, if little noted, tendency to anti-intellectualism. Vocationalism has captured the arts and sciences. Grades, test scores, graduate school admission, the importance of one's first academic or professional appointment, these have become the major items of concern in the young person's preparation for his career. Thus, at one of the nation's best liberal arts colleges we visited this year faculty members assured us that the extremely bright young people at the school were basically anti-intellectual. By this, they did not mean that they were not intelligent or not concerned about their studies but rather that the intensity of the competition for graduate school admission was such that the students could not afford to be playful about their academic pursuits and were not inclined to take chances with courses far from their discipline, or in which they might not get an A, or which would not contribute to building up an impressive academic record.

A philosophy professor ruefully told us that his students commented that they could not understand how anybody could be interested in Aristotle with the world in the shape it is today. The two values of the school were social action commitment and graduate school enrollment. Disinterested pursuit of truth as a good in itself was simply beyond their comprehension, at least in practice.

Now I do not think this should be too surprising. Obviously, if one has despaired of influencing the public sector of life and expects most

satisfaction from the relational elements in the private sector, the pursuit of the good, the true, and the beautiful, at least beyond that which is necessary to sustain interaction with well educated people, does not become very attractive. It would be attractive if there were time, but unfortunately there is so little time.

Seventhly, the new breed seems to be desperately searching for love. Expecting as they do their major satisfaction to come from human relations and being skeptical on the basis of their psychological knowledge of their own ability to enter into these meaningful human relations, they can become highly verbal about why they are not loved and why love is so difficult. Nor is their analysis basically wrong. Child rearing and middle class American society, despite all the modifications and gyrations which it has gone through in the last thirty-five years, still heavily emphasizes performance (though the means of obtaining performance have become more sophisticated and subtle as the years go on). The young person who is loved simply because he is lovable in himself is rather a rarity in striving, achieving middle class society; the conditioned love which demands high aptitude scores at kindergarten entrance is producing a generation which is not only not confident of its own lovability but is highly self-conscious and analytic about its lack of confidence. There is the story about the nursery schools in New York that do have tests upon entering, and they discovered that one-quarter of the students, infants who had taken the tests, had been prepared for it. (Laughter) I did not believe that story. (Laughter)

Recently I was having lunch with one of my colleagues at the university, and he was somewhat depressed because it turned out that his three year old daughter had not made it in the aptitude tests for kindergarten, or nursery school. This was a nursery school that heavily emphasized taking children who are college material. (Laughter) And this fellow who was quite sophisticated was being quite resigned about it all, and yet a little bit unhappy. He said, "After all, she's only three. She may be a late bloomer." (Laughter)

The only ones who are destined in the long run to gain from this situation are the student counselors who must strive to reassure (usually in vain) a whole generation of young people that there is something about them that is lovable. And doubts about love in one's personal life and despair about influence or relevance in one's public life are hardly calculated to produce a generation of bright and cheerful young optimists.

And bright and cheerful young optimists they are certainly not. In my experiences with collegians I must confess that I find them a serious, lifeless, joyless, lugubrious lot. Whether it has ever been fun to be young I do not know. I was never young myself. I cannot testify from personal experience. But I strongly doubt that the world has ever known a generation of young people so avowedly and determinedly without vitality or zest. Whatever is to be said about the current craze for psychodilic drugs, there is at least some reason to be skeptical about a generation which apparently cannot find happiness or relaxation without artificial assistance whether it be the exotic assistance of LSD or the more commonplace assistance of John Barleycorn.

In Kenniston's words, "The academically committed student therefore is not in general a gay, frivolous, or abandoned person." [He can say that again.] "His public life is regulated by a need to maintain his academic rank. His private life is an effort to discover or create some rationale for his public life and his whole life is often dominated by his attempt to create some synthesis of public and private selves. American students therefore lack levity, gaiety, wit, and whimsy that characterize their counterparts of equal academic attainment in universities abroad. Simply to acquire the necessary expertise requires great effort from all but the most brilliant and to figure why one is making this effort to justify the struggle to find something worth living for takes the rest of the effort. There is less and less time just to have fun."

That there is something wrong when the world's richest society produces a morose and depressed generation of youth does not seem to require much proof.

I think this last quote from Kenniston underlines the final point I want to make about the new breed of student and one which I think is the most important.

The American young person is alienated precisely because his elders have failed him. The young collegian, like any person moving towards maturity and adulthood seeking for meaning, is seeking for an ideology in order that he might have an identity. Ideology is especially important for him because the world in which he lives is so complicated and so vast and in such overwhelming need of explanation. But meaning, especially for his public life, and for the synthesis of public and private life is something which we who are his educators precisely cannot provide. Because we do not have a meaning for the young people we argue

either that there isn't any meaning in life (surely the counsel of despair) or that if there is a meaning each one must figure it out for himself and no teacher or adult should presume to communicate his vision of reality to anyone else. Thus, the almost official religion of American academia is that meaning is something we do not talk about.

Positive discussion of the relevance of human existence is today almost as taboo as discussion of sex was in decades gone by. The folly of human existence, the mechanics of sexual intercourse, even the lamentable demise of the Deity, these are quite acceptable subjects for literature, drama, and coffee house conversation. But a positive and dynamic explanation of the meaning of human existence in a complicated, rationalized, formalized, bureaucratized world in which we live, ah, no, my friends, that sort of thing a lady and a gentleman never discuss.

This is, I suppose you think, the sort of thing one would expect from a professional religionist (at least one of his manifestations) whose secret assumption is that he, or at least his Church, has a meaning which if only people would listen to him would straighten out all the problems that mankind, especially youthful mankind, must face.

Alas and alack, would that it were so. Anyone who thinks that American Roman Catholicism as it currently operates is able to provide much in the way of systematic meaning for its young adherents has not had the experience of visiting thirty Catholic institutions of higher learning in the course of the past year. To let the cat out of the bag, ladies and gentlemen, I assure you we are not doing a better job than anyone else. We indeed propound a system of propositions which are taken to give meaning to life (though in the present state of Catholic theology and philosophy departments we propound them pretty damned poorly), but our young people stare at us blankly and say, "God, we think we believe in; Christ, we surely dig. The Church we will continue to cling to if for no other reason than out of habit, but the ideology you teach us, my friend, doesn't mean a cotton picking thing to us."

Thus, I fear I must admit that, as a meaning and value communicating institution, organized religion, and especially organized religion in its higher educational manifestations, has been no more successful than anyone else. While some of our secularist counterparts may affirm that there is no meaning or at least no meaning beyond the empirical, we affirm quite bravely and boldly that there is indeed meaning,



and universal meaning, only we're not quite sure that we know well enough what it is to be able to communicate it clearly and articulately to young people.

In conclusion, the situation I have described has much in common with the plight of past generations of young people because no generation is in complete discontinuity with its predecessor. The alienation from meaning and a search for happiness in a private life has been with us for a long time, and it will remain with us as long as the academic establishment takes as its official faith the notion, "There isn't much we can say about meaning or purpose."

I would submit that this abdication of responsibility represents a major retreat, indeed, a retreat which may mark one of the great failures of the Western intellectual tradition, and perhaps its last failure. Despite the non-ideological but very generous enthusiasm of a small element of the present generation of young Americans I can foresee no particular reason to expect a change in the vast majority. I would argue that a much more plausible phenomenon than the emergence of a new left is rather the appearance of the new sullenness which combines the privatism of the uninvolved students of a decade ago with a cynicism about the established society that may be the only ultimate contribution of the new leftist criticism to American student culture. If the new sullenness indeed turns out to be a typical element in American collegiate culture, I would suspect that it would merely cloak a new despair, an increasing hopelessness about finding meaning and purpose surely in one's public life and increasingly even in one's private life. I would note in passing that both the death of John Kennedy, who provided a bright ray of hope for all too few years for many Americans and also the complicated, ambiguous, and messy Vietnamese crisis have merely contributed both to the sullenness and despair.

I do not relish the role of Cassandra, much less of the prophet Amos, and I wish I could share the enthusiasm of those who feel that the Peace Corps and the civil rights movement represent a major change in American collegiate culture. I am inclined to think, rather, that the idealism of the past years does indeed represent an addition to youth culture and does provide an alternative pattern of behavior for a creative minority but I do not think that at least thus far it gives us any solid reason to hope that the pace of alienation has been any more than slightly slowed down.

Under such circumstances, I for one am afraid that I would not want to be a student personnel administrator, especially when a young person asks that



thunderous question -- why? (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN McCARTAN: Thank you, Father Greeley. It is a relief to learn that you have not really said farewell to the new breed. We all hope to continue to profit from your further analysis and observations of American youth, as well as the new breed.

We would have about ten or fifteen minutes of questioning. The Father has kindly consented to have a questioning period. Those who have a question, would you kindly stand, and speak in a loud, clear voice, and state your name and your school, and restrict your question to a thousand words or less.

DEAN JAMES W. EWING (Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri): I appreciate the very insightful analysis here very much. It is very descriptive of what we are confronting. I just wanted to ask one question in regard to the ideological statements: If you see anywhere within this kind of pessimistic analysis a kind of -- not affirmation, but perhaps a hope that out of the chaos that a new order will somehow emerge, and that out of just the plain sort of contentless process itself that a certain kind of program or a certain kind of ideology will be produced, a kind of substanceless hope for something that will come.

REVEREND GREELEY: I think you can find hope at least in the fact that some of the more sophisticated and committed -- what I call the creative minority -- are beginning to see that Kenniston is right and that you do need something rather than generalizations to sustain you through a life of social commitment.

So I think there is increasingly a search for ideology which may not be as hidebound and inflexible as the Marxism of the thirties, but which also does provide some sort of vision of what a society should be like, and some of the tools for articulate and hardheaded social criticism. Harry Cox tells me that some of the SDS leaders in this part of the country have come to him and said, "You know, we think maybe you have got something to say to us, because Marxism is just, you know, its net discussion at this point is so irrelevant. And we feel we need something and we hear tell of this secular city of yours that makes a suggestion."

But I am not saying necessarily that Harry's ideology or his diagnosis of society is one that could be the groundwork for building an ideology relevant to the young people. I think that this sort of curiosity

that he described does represent some sort of hope and promise. I am not going to jump up and down with joy over it quite yet.

I should have planted some questions. (Laughter) It would be better to say, where are those questions I planted? (Laughter) Father Yanitelli cannot be here; that's the only explanation. (Laughter)

DEAN LESTER L. HALE (University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida): Which way should the church be going then to try to find a new type of idealism?

REVEREND GREELEY: I will have to ask some church man when I see him. (Laughter) Now, if I were a bishop, or even a pope (laughter), I think that the church, and this is not just using a cliché, must more and more enter into dialog, and dialog with society. It must not be afraid of the city or the activities of the city. It must not feel that it has ready-made answers, except in vague general principle. And it must engage in conversation with the public sector of life, and find out what is going on there, what the needs and problems are of the secular city, and how, as a result of dialog, the churches can begin to say something relevant in the way of judgment, and in the way of prophecy, but also in the way of hope and confidence for life in the city.

I use the city not in the geographical sense, but in the technical sense of scientific social culture.

REV. BRO. JOHN E. DALY (Iona College, New Rochelle, New York): Father, do you think that if the decrees of the Vatican Council were applied more quickly that this would help, at least in the realm of Catholic education?

REVEREND GREELEY: Yes, I surely do. I think that if the renewal which was expressed so marvelously well in the documents of the Council would become a reality in Catholic higher education across the country next year then we would have a very dynamic and innovative force at work. But I do not think that is going to happen. I think we are going to have a lot of trouble before it happens.

My own impression -- and this is kind of private information for the Catholic educators -- is that time is running out. I would have thought when I started the grand tour this winter that our leaders had from two to five years to make the Vatican Council decrees a reality at the grass roots. Now I am not sure that they even have a year or more. But unless

very, very quickly the spirit of the Vatican does permeate the boondocks, then we are going to have a whole series of powder kegs go off this winter. A couple went off last winter that happened to get into the New York Times, but I think they are small potatoes to what American Catholicism could encounter in years to come, unless it renews itself quickly, and this includes conflicts on campuses, ladies and gentlemen. One day you may wake up and find out that your students have taken arms.

DEAN THOMAS B. DUTTON (Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan): When you suggest that there will be a farewell to this new breed, are you thereby suggesting another breed to take its place? What do you see in the future?

REVEREND GREELEY: My farewell was just saying, "Boys and girls, I am too old; I do not understand you any more, and you do not understand me, so I am going off and sit in my rocking chair and contemplate ultimate verities." So it was a very insincere one. So long as the market demands material of this sort, it is a very insincere one. (Laughter) This was a third new breed article, and the editors said, "Is there some way you can indicate that this will be the last one?" (Laughter) So that is why we came up with the title.

Your question nonetheless; I think, is a very good one. What is going to happen? What will come after the generation in the first half of the sixties?

I have the impression through some people that I talk to -- and it is still a very vague impression -- that it is very much harder this summer to recruit volunteers for the civil rights program, tutoring programs, or for any kind of service. At least some of the overseas organizations (I am not sure if this is true of the Peace Corps or not) are finding it increasingly difficult to stir up interest. So it could be that the creative explosion, even of a minority, which marked the early sixties, is petering out, and that we may go back to a situation we had in the late fifties, of almost total non-involvement. So it may well be that the volunteer generation has come to an end rather abruptly. I hope not, but there is some evidence of this that ought to be watched rather closely.

DEAN JAMES RYAN (Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania): Is it your impression, from your work, Father, that personnel administrators are less aware of what the students are thinking today than in other generations? Are they really conscious

of what this psychology and the frame of mind of these students is?

REVEREND GREELEY: Well, I think an awful lot of them are pretty conscious of what it is. You know, they will hear things like what I said this morning, and say, "At least some of what he said is true." I think they are conscious of the psychology, but they do not know how to handle it. This may be especially true in the Catholic colleges where the individualism, personalism, and relationalism of young people is viewed as a threat to authority, and hence the dean, who is the authority figure, becomes very defensive. When he does that, of course, he has really finked out. You know, nothing.

I have noticed this too --I suppose most of you have -- in the Catholic system that there is less and less respect for the priest, and they are just not admired in the way they seem to have been in years gone by. There was a time when to have had a Catholic school education was something of which you could be proud. I do not think the young people today are really so proud.

CHAIRMAN McCARTAN: Thank you very much, Father. (Applause)

There are two announcements.

Because of the interest in the pre-conference film, "A Semester of Discontent," -- it is a National Education TV film distributed by Indiana University -- this will be shown again tonight, 7:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the Williamsburg Room, chaired by Dean Elmer Meyer of the University of Wisconsin.

There is a correction to be made in the program. The Regional Breakfasts are at 7:30 to 8:45.

If there are no further pronouncements, the program is concluded. Thank you.

... The Third General Session recessed at twelve-five o'clock ...

LUNCHEON  
Monday - June 27, 1966

Liberal Arts College Representatives

The Luncheon of the Liberal Arts College Representatives, held in the Spanish Ballroom, convened at one-twenty-five o'clock, Dean William Swift, Dean of Students, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, presiding.

CHAIRMAN SWIFT: If you will please take your places, we will get started. We are running just a little bit late.

Our invocation will be given by Dean Robert Porter of Alaska Methodist University.

DEAN ROBERT PORTER (Alaska Methodist University, Anchorage, Alaska): Let us pray.

O, Thou eternal Father in whom we live and move and have our being, who with the gifts of life give also all things needful to that life, as together we eat this food and share the fellowship, grant each of us the gifts of honest humility and sincere gratitude; humility that we may realize how great is our good fortune, our privilege in being here; and gratitude that we may honestly try to share our privilege with others less fortunate.

Bless us now with the awareness of Thy presence, for we ask it in the spirit of Jesus Christ. Amen.

... Luncheon was served ...

CHAIRMAN SWIFT: I suppose since I am surrounded by so many sociologists I should say, welcome to a sub-culture of NASPA. We are glad that you are here.

Dean Porter is from Alaska, and I am from Texas, and I warn you, Texas stories are no longer in the running for any kind of an award. I have been hearing Alaska stories all through the meal.

There are some people here that I would like to present before we have our address.

I would like to recognize our esteemed President, Dr. Glen Nygreen. (Applause)

There are two other gentlemen who perform very valuable services for NASPA. First, the Editor

of the NASPA Journal, Dean Richard Siggelkow. (Applause) He tells me that he would like to encourage you people from the liberal arts schools to contribute to this Journal, and I hope you will.

Then we have with us here also the Director of NASPA Placement Service, Dean Richard Hulet. (Applause)

When I received the biographical data on our speaker for today, I must confess to a slight degree of eeriness, I suppose you would say, because when I began reading the data, I noted that we were of the same age; we had both served the same four years in the Navy, came out with the same rank; we had children of the same age; and right on down the line. Then today we show up, both of us in dark suits with red and black striped ties. (Laughter)

But I was brought up short to realize that there were quite a few differences; namely, that he is President and I am simply Dean. (Laughter)

It always helps to have something of the background of the man you hear, and I would like now to give you a little of the relevant background of our speaker. What I have just told you was totally irrelevant.

Dr. John R. Howard did his formal educational work at the University of Pennsylvania, where he was also at one time instructor of political science and public administration. He served in administrative capacities there, and then at Lake Forest College in Illinois -- that nice little idyllic spot on Lake Michigan -- where he was Vice President and Acting President, and of course now is President of Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon.

There are many things in which he has been engaged in community and civic affairs. In the Presbyterian church he has been active in educational affairs, as well as local church leadership.

He has been involved in state activities in Oregon, and he has been Director, Manager, and Governor of all sorts of things. When I read this biographical sheet I got very limp. It seems that a man with this kind of energy would make anyone by comparison feel like he was not doing anything.

He has been asked by your Conference Chairman to speak to us and give some views of the role of student personnel administrators, particularly the chief personnel administrator, the role that they

should play in the changing higher educational patterns of smaller colleges and universities, particularly with regard to the private sector.

I asked him if he had given a title to what he was going to say. He said if he gave it one, it would be "The Student Personnel Administrator and the New Breed." President Howard, we are glad to have you. (Applause)

DR. JOHN R. HOWARD (President, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon): Thank you, Bill.

You fellows from Texas are all generous, aren't you? I've heard more than one reference to President Johnson's support of higher education these past two days. One man told how he had learned well as a protege of President Roosevelt, who was no slouch in pioneering federal support programs. FDR was a great man. Many people loved him. I heard of one recently who journeyed up to Hyde Park to see where the President was buried. When he saw two or three soldiers on duty there he wondered aloud as how it must be pretty expensive to keep soldiers on duty there around the clock, to which one of the soldiers replied, "Yes, sir, I guess it is, but think how much more it would cost if he got out of here and went down to Washington to help Mr. Johnson." (Laughter)

When asked once how he defined his morality, President Lincoln is said to have said, "When I do good, I feel good; when I do bad, I feel bad." I wonder if he -- and we -- might not also say, "When I do well, I feel fine. When I do poorly, I suffer agonies."

Is this perhaps why the theme of this Conference is so relevant? By the very implication of "reform" in higher education, we imply dissatisfaction with what we do. We suffer. And we cannot live with pain. Hence: reform.

It may be helpful before attempting a few suggestions about the role of the student personnel administrator in these reforms to review our context.

Why do we suffer?

Why would we reform?

Philip Jacob started much of the recent discussion nearly ten years ago with his "Changing Values in Colleges." He reported that the colleges had in general been unsuccessful in the area where it counted most: in the value systems of the students. Despite

college, bigots remained bigots, fundamentalists remained fundamentalists, liberals remained liberals. John Gardner later put it this way:

"All too often we are giving young people cut flowers when we should be teaching them to grow their own plants. If education is to be effective it must aim at developing in students such characteristics as versatility, adaptiveness, inquisitiveness, creativity, and high motivation. In turn, this should create a 'self renewing society.'

"Such a society will understand that the only stability today is stability in motion. ... It will recognize that its capacity for renewal depends on the individuals who make it up."

Since the Jacob study, our students have been under a ruthless microscope. Like bacteria, they are observed, sorted and classified. Father Greeley gave us an able directive this morning. Our students make marvelous copy for the national magazines. Time magazine recently reported the classifications of Kenneth Kenniston of Yale, which was quoted by Father Greeley this morning. Kenniston's suggestion is that the preponderant number of students had become "professionalists" -- valuing competence above ambition, popularity or grace. He said they were essentially privatists -- they wanted to be left alone; existentialists -- living largely for the moment; and ethically he found them relativists. The remaining students, a minority, he divided amongst the activists, rebellious, lacking firm conviction, generally supporting short-range programs; the disaffiliates who were anti-system, usually quietly resentful, pessimistic, beatnik, LSD users; and a smaller group of underachievers, those who reject themselves rather than society.

All are non-ideological, distrustful of dogma.

Professor Raabi of Columbia calls them insecure, generally because our liberal arts colleges provide them no secure base of competence.

They are free -- and they are burdened. Eric Hoffer says this best: "You do not go to a free society to find a carefree people." Consider the free people on your campus:

Socially free. With an acute social conscience.

Economically free. They can buy but they must choose. They are mobile.



Politically free. Despite any concern for paternalism in Washington, have more people ever participated in the governance of their country?

And intellectually free. With the resultant mountain of idea alternatives from which to select.

Consider the burdens of choice that accompany these freedoms. Consider, too, Vietnam, automation, complex education, the overwhelming presence of government, compounded experiences.

Consider the relaxation of regulations on your campus. Where has the responsibility gone? To the student.

There are other roads toward understanding why the student is so volatile.

He still reads Ayn Rand. Like Ayn Rand, he's beginning to check his premises. He's receiving much help. He hears from distinguished scholars -- like Dr. Linden Mander here in Seattle at the University of Washington -- that the traditional bases for developing international policy are no longer valid:

Nationalism.

Ideology.

Our concept of the nature of power.

The student knows that these are abstractions and he has found that the absolutely worst enemy is the one inflexibly wedded to an abstraction. This enemy becomes what Eric Hoffer calls a true believer -- a fanatic.

He does not want to become equally fanatical with an opposing abstraction because he knows from analysis of four great wars in less than 50 years that it can kill you and weaken your country, win or lose the war, and only further the enmity.

He clings to life options.

He becomes skeptical of all unproved, generalized ideologies. He is leaving the church. Patriotism is not enough. It is no longer his country right or wrong. It is the right that he would honor. It is life that he cherishes.

As a change of pace, we can learn something about the situation we would reform from new evidence about the "adult learner" compiled by Father Greeley's staff at the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago. They surveyed 24,000 adult students.

One of every five adult Americans (25,000,000) studied something new last year. Three-fourths of them were high school or college graduates.

People without much education simply do not study anything very often, the report states.

Most adult students were under 50, live in cities or suburbs, earn better than average incomes. About one-half were women.

Retired people do not often take advantage of the opportunities for continued learning.

The most popular courses are related to jobs. The second most popular courses are related to hobbies and recreation.

The report concludes that adults prefer the practical to the academic. Incidentally, it also shows in its own way that education is achieving one of its classic goals: it whets an appetite for continued learning.

Are today's college students so very different from these 24,000 adults? If not, how do we turn this knowledge to advantage? What does a student's concern for the practical say to a dean of students? What should it say to a faculty about the way philosophy is taught?

At the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, many are afraid we may learn the wrong things from such evidence. Consider these excerpts from their recent conference on the University in America at Beverley Hills. Each speaks in his own way of things higher education is doing that it should not, or is not doing but should. Note the concern that we confuse ends and means, inferring a need to renew our concentration on ends.

Robert Hutchins: "What education can and should do is help people become human. The object of education is not manpower, but manhood."

Senator Fulbright: "Far from being less important in this age of advanced technology, liberal education is more critically important than ever before, because [its content] has to do with the most critically important question of our time which is whether technology is going to be an instrument of human happiness or a vehicle of our destruction."

Ruhl Bartlett: "I will not despair of the human race as long as our institutions of education

continue to place the highest priority on the ends of life. When this ceases to be true, we will be in peril."

W. H. Perry (Vice President of the Center):  
"At least to one observer, the college is floundering in a bog of self doubt, contradictory purposes, public relations, and intellectual inertia."

"A ... reason why the college is failing is because it has unresistingly turned from a community into a corporation."

"The [corporate] doctrine of meeting a society's wants and needs results in leaving thousands of high school and college graduates semi-literate and unprepared to go on with their educations."

Jacob Bronowsky (Salk Institute): "Every ethic looks two ways: it has a public face and a private one. That is, it must hold a man within his society and yet it must make him feel that he follows his own free bent. No ethic is effective which does not link both these, the social duty with the sense of individuality."

Professor John Weiss: "... the vast bulk of American students remain undirected and unreformed. Typically, the college teacher is ignorant of the total educational experience he and his colleagues are imparting to the students. The best of them can hardly find out what other courses the students take. Hence, even the faculty reformer is primarily concerned with improving his own course ... not the complete intellectual life of the student."

The context was given new perspective just recently, in a remarkable new book by John Rader Platt called "The Step of Man." He says:

"... We are not at the beginning of continually accelerating change, but we are in the middle of a unique transitional crisis, like adolescence, as we make the jump from an undeveloped scientific and technological society to a fully developed one."

"We are being compelled to reorganize the internal structure and powers of the race into a mature human integration that could be called manhood."

"We are now nearing the end of the era of change. We have been isolated human beings, selfish, combative, ignorant, helpless. For several hundred years the great evolutionary hormones of

knowledge and technology have been pressing us... into a single coordinated humankind.

"It was implicit in the biological material all along, as surely as the butterfly is implicit in the caterpillar. We have been men. We are emerging into man."

As he says, "It is a tremendous prospect."

However the context is defined, it is small wonder that the colleges and universities are reforming. A larger, more complex society, absorbing more knowledge, developing new syntheses, will be forever restless and, even if wrong, will relentlessly innovate, experiment and redefine.

Consider just a few of the reforms in higher education:

More flexible organizations of the curriculum allowing greater recognition of individual differences.

3-3 systems and other calendar reforms.

Increased use of advanced placement.

Increased challenging of courses by examination.

4-year Master's programs.

More and more independent study.

Substantially more use of undergraduate student research as a learning device.

Widespread introduction of overseas study programs with still more student sophistication resulting.

Team teaching.

Closed circuit televising and videotaping of the student-teacher or student performer.

Cluster colleges with more use of residence halls as learning centers.

Increased use of the pass-fail pattern of grading.

Coeducational housing.

Structured involvement with the community's problems, best illustrated by tutoring programs in economically depressed districts near the campus.

More student counselors, student R.A.s, student teaching assistants, and student departmental aides.

More student participation in the determination and execution of institutional policies.

Almost complete abandonment of compulsory class attendance.

Much more freedom out of the classroom, with relaxed curfews, if any at all, and relaxed dress requirements.

And much more. But this highly stimulated, abundantly challenged, emotionally involved, freed but burdened student cannot always take this barrel of riches. As Professor Raabi says, he's insecure. He seeks some solid walls against which to rest or push. And whose ward is he all this time? If not yours, where do you send him?

If we are humanizing the student; if our concern is with his life and not how he makes his living; if we are concerned with him as an individual; if we do believe that we are building the future of a free society as we work with these people, no one, no faculty member, no administrator, no single student has a more central role than the student personnel administrator. For he contacts the student where he lives:

In his emotional life.

In his financial life.

In his home life, whether in a college dormitory or not.

In the arena of his fears and frustrations and confusions.

In short, you get him when the weight of his burdens and the fullness of his insecurity become too much for him. He turns to you for help. And may I say, if he does not, you most certainly have failed.

How do you respond? How, in responding, are you reforming higher education?

Colleges -- public and independent -- have limited resources. Even in student personnel administration all reforms must contemplate most effective utilization of these limited resources.

In your office, does the bulk of your time, your work, attention, and money go first to "problems" or to opportunities? Does much of your energy go to areas where even extraordinarily successful performance will have minimal impact on the basic character of the college?

My first challenge to you is: Are you sure that what you do do is wisely done? Is it the right thing to do?

Repeated research indicates that in social situations a very small number of events, decisions, actions -- 10% to 20% at most -- account for 90% of all results, whereas the great majority of the activity accounts for 10% or less of the results.

My second challenge to you is: Have you defined the area in which 90% of all student personnel problems could be essentially resolved or anticipated with 10% of your continuing effort? Why don't you believe it possible? Have you tried?

Lammot duPont Copeland, president of duPont Corporation, says that "The solutions of our problems in education will not emerge as huge cosmic entities... they will be solved, when they are solved, by small groups of intelligent men and women thinking about them, discussing them, and gradually distilling, in their intellects and their imaginations, the approaches that will ultimately yield success."

Challenge number three: Have you defined your small group of students, faculty and administration to seriously discuss the opportunities in student personnel programming at your institution? Have they begun to distill those promising approaches? Have you clearly stated their mission?

Recently we were involved in the search for a dean of students at Lewis and Clark College. Of 117 applicants fewer than half a dozen could answer that question affirmatively. Innovations, if any, came from outside their offices. They were clearly problem, not opportunity, oriented.

If students, following most recent learning and motivation theory, are wisely released, yet work best when they know where they are, that is, what their institution is, where it stands, how far they can go, when they know about themselves as learning animals, how it happens and what their active role must be for it to take place, then consider these obvious challenges:

Number 4. How imaginative is your student orientation?

Number 5. How clearly and unambiguously have you stated your position on student life outside the classroom? How sure are you that these expectations have been communicated?

Walter Lippman has said that:

"However crude and clumsy our knowledge of the process, there is no doubt that character is acquired by experience and education. Within limits that we have not measured, human nature is malleable. Because human nature is, as Hocking puts it, 'the most plastic part of the living world, the most adaptable, the most educable,' it is also the most mal-adaptable and mis-educable."

Challenge number 6. Do you think in terms of the development of the character of your students? What recent program proposal bears your signature? Are you sure you are not waiting for the mal-adapted and the mis-educated to come to your office seeking remedial therapy?

If ever there was one, this is the day of the student personnel administrator. There is national concern for the effective development of the individual student. Students themselves, their parents, government, business, our many civic and social agencies are all vitally concerned and involved. You sit in the middle of a remarkable laboratory. Yours is a genuine opportunity for innovation.

Ralph Linton wrote about the greatest psychic need of man: The need is an emotional response. The musician must have his audience with him, the actor must feel the response of the house, the speaker must feel his listeners are with him, the interviewed man must feel that the climate is right if he would speak with freedom, candor and effectiveness.

You cannot speak to each student at your college in this way; but in today's context each student needs and should expect just such an emotional connection. Even our most difficult ones. As Longfellow says:

"If we would read the secret history of [even] our enemies, we would find in each man's life sorrow and suffering enough to disarm all hostility."

Challenge number 7. Have you developed an in-depth counseling system so that each student at your institution has someone to whom he can turn and hope to find an emotional acceptance, to find empathy?

Ladies and Gentlemen, you are professionals. Before you return to your several campuses, is it too much to hope that some few of you will brainstorm an optimum student personnel program? A program somewhat

more than the sum of the parts of the workshops here available.

Would you have your students look alike? Dress alike? Wear hair alike? Would you have them clean? Would you have all of them, none of them, or some of them participate in athletics? How seriously?

Would you eliminate or expand student government? Would you have faculty government? Student and faculty government? Community government? What policy questions would you have laid before your government -- however constituted? Is counseling on a one-to-one basis feasible? Have you considered group counseling? How would you establish group counseling? What are your premises? Would you provide tutorial relationships? For everyone? For the very weak? Where would faculty advisers fit in your plan?

Housing: are you ready for the coeducational housing, as in the Olympic hotel? No? Then what have we learned in building two million dormitory rooms in eight years? What of conduct problems? On campus and off. Would you give them without reservation to student judiciary boards? If so, why?

Are unrestricted driving privileges in your plan? Does this in any way interfere with the main mission of the college? How do we know? And what of girls' hours?

Develop such a plan. No one is in a better position. Within it seek to release the student to learn. At the same time help him to understand himself better. When it is complete, fight for its adoption and understood acceptance at your college or university. You could, I believe, assure the future of higher education just when prosperity, with its expansion and building programs, seems to be pulling it away from its central purpose.

Edwin Markham's sensitive way of expressing it is perhaps apropos:

We are all blind until we see  
That in the human plan  
Nothing is worth the making if  
It does not make the man.

Why build these cities glorious  
If man unbuilt goes?  
In vain we build the world, unless  
The builder also grows.

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)



CHAIRMAN SWIFT: Thank you, President Howard.

We have a few minutes before the next items on the NASPA agenda are to take place, so we are going to give you the benefit of those few minutes, and be dismissed at this time.

... The Luncheon Session recessed at twelve-forty o'clock ...

---

INFORMATION SESSION  
Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"The Role of the Student Personnel  
Administrator in Institutional  
Research"

Information Session, meeting in the Williamsburg Room, convened at two o'clock, Dean Thomas Hansmeier, Associate Dean of Students, Southern Illinois University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN HANSMEIER: Just to make certain everybody is in the right room, the topic of discussion here today is "The Role of the Student Personnel Administrator in Institutional Research."

Mr. John Blasi is passing out little IBM cards, which you have encountered before. We would appreciate it if you would hold on to those and fill them out at the conclusion of this session, and pass them back in as you leave.

My name is Thomas Hansmeier. I am a Student Personnel Administrator at the Edwardsville Campus of Southern Illinois University. Speaking in behalf of the Board of Trustees, President Morris, Dean Graham, and I am sure others, I want to clarify that the Edwardsville Campus is not a branch of the Carbondale Campus. It is, according to official policy, a co-equal campus of the University. You might think of me as a fellow who is lucky enough to get his name on the program simply by calling the meeting to order, introducing the panelists, and then adjourning the meeting about an hour and a half later.

The workers here today are seated at the table. Immediately to my left is Dr. Patricia Cross, who is with Educational Testing Service. And to my far left is Dr. James Sours, who is with the American College Testing Program in Iowa City, E.T.S. and Princeton.

I had better give them equal billing here.

In introducing this topic, the problem could be stated that there exists a real need for research in several areas directly related to student personnel work, and this research need is not being fulfilled. For example, I think all of us would have to agree that one of our primary responsibilities is to interpret the student to the various publics of the institution, to the faculty, to other administrators, and, actually, we also have to interpret the student body to the students themselves.

Pepinsky has indicated to us that student

personnel administrators could be and perhaps should be conducting research in five related variables: 1, the developing student; 2, his cultural and social background; 3, the developing educational setting; 4, its cultural and social environment; and, 5, interactions between student and setting.

This type of research alone would probably take us the next century to conduct. It is an on-going kind of project.

Also, I think all of us would recognize and admit that evaluation is important. In 1959 Erikson and Hatch, in an article, made this statement: "It may be said without reservation that the failure of the staff to include this part of programing" -- referring to evaluation -- "is one way of signing the death warrant of the program."

This is a very flat statement. In spite of such protestations of the importance of evaluation, we have really done relatively little in student personnel work. I think it is significant that in NASPA itself there once was a standing commission called Program and Practices Evaluation, and about two or three years ago that standing commission was made an ad hoc committee, not even of a continuing committee status. This demotion of the group, if you want to view it as that, was based on the premise, on the observable fact that over a period of several years this commission had not done very much. There had not been enough activity in this area of evaluation to keep the commission going, or the commission had not generated enough activity to keep it going, which, in a sense, I think, is a condemnation of our professional society.

There are other areas of need that have been pointed out to us. The social psychology of student groups; we do quite a bit of talking about pure group pressure as student personnel administrators, but how much do we really know about how group loyalties and group affiliations affect the behavior of individual students?

Group procedures and techniques is an area. We work with groups of students every day. We supposedly are the opinion leaders of the campus. We are the molders of opinion. We are the climate creators, as came out in the first general session this morning. And yet the research that has been done in this area of group techniques comes almost entirely from the group psychotherapists and the group dynamics people.

Another area would be mental health, in the educational setting. American educators in general, and certainly student personnel workers in particular,

purport to promote emotional health and well-being of the students, and yet the research in this area has been superficial and we do not really know what we should do in manipulating the environment to reach the conditions for optimal mental health.

These are just a few of the examples of the kind of research needs which as yet are unfulfilled.

In saying these things, I am not being hypercritical of myself or of you people, or of our student personnel fraternity men across the country. There are a number of good reasons, I think, why we have not been doing more research. First of all, it was brought out last night most of us have basically a service and action orientation. We are the kind of people who like to do things to help other people. We tend not to sit back and think about what we should be doing, engage in abstract speculation. What Burroughs said, back in 1959, I think still holds true, when he said: "The attractiveness of theory among those who write about students is unmatched by those who serve students."

Another factor would be the programs of graduate education in student personnel which are not aimed at producing student personnel administrators who are sophisticated in the area of research design and methods.

And, finally -- and this is what we constantly hear at meetings like NASPA -- there are just fantastic pressures on all of us to do the daily routine of our jobs; so much so that our days from eight to five are filled with the routine things and we do not have the chance to sit back and think creatively about the different types of research we might be doing.

We are fortunate in having two people with us today who can discuss the role of the student personnel administrator in institutional research from, I think, a sympathetic point of view. Both Pat Cross and Jim Sours have been student personnel administrators themselves, so they know what we face. At the same time, they have been actively involved in research themselves. They work with people who are doing research. And so I am sure they can give us some insights as to how we might better fulfill our role in institutional research.

We have decided rather arbitrarily that our time here might be most valuably spent if first Jim and then Pat presented what they had to say, and then we could have a little talk back and forth with the panelists, and then we can open it up to you people for your questions and comments and criticisms.

So, with that introduction, I will turn it

over to Jim Sours.

DR. JAMES SOURS (Executive Vice President, American College Testing Program): Thank you very much, Chairman Tom. Ladies and Gentlemen: In 1951 I accepted an appointment as Assistant Professor of Political Science and Assistant to the President at Wichita University, which is now Wichita State University. Shortly after I arrived on their campus a special committee of the faculty, which had been appointed by the President, submitted to the President a report with recommendations concerning the establishment of a program in student personnel administration, for they had none up until that time. One of my first duties was when the President handed me that report and said, "Find out what this is all about and see what we can set up." Well, I think Jim Rhatigan, back there, can tell you I never did find out what it was all about, but in the course of pursuing the assignment I fortuitously discovered the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and through a membership that lasted six or seven years thereafter, I got a lot of help from NASPA, and I am deeply indebted and appreciative.

I think it is difficult to generalize about the role of the student personnel administrator in institutional research. For example, there is the descriptive problem versus the normative one. What is in reality as against what ought to be. Then there is the problem of disparity; disparity of individual backgrounds and of individual interests, disparity of assignments, and disparity of institutional resources. Despite such inherent problems, however, let me place my neck on the block for the sake of the discussion that is planned to follow these presentations.

I will take the position that it is probably unrealistic to expect the typical dean of students to play a major role as an institutional researcher. There are several reasons that would appear to support such a view, but among the more persuasive is the fact that he usually does not have the time, and he frequently lacks the skills of the researcher. This is not to say he and his staff may not produce a variety of so-called studies related to their day to day operational problems (for example, studies of the effect of training residence hall visitors in interview procedures or studies of drop outs or mid-term delinquents, or demographic compilations, or studies of student attitudes toward campus food or discipline, or investigations of fraternity depledging, or any of a host of other such and similar studies) but to cloak such studies with the mantle of such a term as institutional research is unnecessary and somewhat misleading, as I perceive it; and I have now, I guess, completely stated the terms of my devil's

advocacy. Let me be arbitrary in my assumptions and in my definitions.

One of the continuing processes that must underlie good institutional administration, for which, incidentally, the college president is ultimately responsible, is planning. By planning I mean the facilitation of decision making -- good decisions. And good decisions in turn presuppose good information and some predictive guesses about the probable consequences of alternative courses of action.

At the most significant levels of concern, information, decisions and planning are centered about problems related to the articulated goals of the institution, the choice of means best suited to the fulfillment of those goals, and to the conservation of institutional resources, and to their optimum deployment. As I see it, this is the level at which institutional research should come into play. The so-called studies mentioned a moment ago are also necessary, and I am not here to belittle those, but I do not view them purely as institutional research, as I have defined it, although they may be related. Nor do I view their proponents as institutional researchers. Rather, they are performing what I consider to be normal administrator or, as you heard this morning, bureaucratic functions of cataloging what is, establishing criteria, and helping to routinize recurring decisions; that kind of thing.

This morning the discussion seemed to concentrate on professionalism, the fact that the profession seems to presuppose a body of knowledge, and some appropriate methods for the manipulation of that knowledge. This, in turn, leads to the ability to identify problems and perhaps to solve them. Hopefully, however, the student personnel administrator will use and encourage institutional research, because it is one of the rational tools for problem identification and problem solving. Max Weber, a German sociologist, on whose ideas some of the remarks this morning, I suppose, were based, emphasized that bureaucracy, among all forms of human organization, is rational as none of the others can be, for the simple reason that it has the unique capacity to bring together in a unified effort the specialties of many people, and to solve problems that continually confront it.

There is a basic reason, but it is not unrelated to a political consideration as well as an organizational one, if you will. I mean that on a college campus everyone, but everyone, is an expert on college students, because everyone sees them every day. Thus the man, including the personnel administrator, who tries to communicate something about students to

the faculty or to his fellow administrators, and who bases his communication on his own observations, will be viewed as no more or less an authority than those who compose his audience. But research knowledge of students gives him something his audience does not have and thus some credentials for exercising influence and persuasion. This, however, raises the question of what types of research information a personnel administrator is likely to need.

First, I think he will need descriptive information. For example, he needs a description of the ability levels, the English and mathematic skills of his students, something about their family income, perhaps, their college and vocational goals, and so on. In other words, descriptions that help to answer the question "What kind of student body do we have at our institution?" Such information is essential for forming decisions about extracurricular needs, counseling and placement needs, financial aid services, and many related matters. It is also necessary, in order to keep faculty and administration aware of individual differences, and the consequent need to provide diversified programs and services. And, as you know, diversity is a major characteristic of American higher education.

In addition, I think he needs certain descriptive characteristics about the institution itself, over a long period of time.

In addition to descriptive information about students and about the institution, the personnel administrator needs predictive information. Given a descriptive set of student and institutional characteristics, what can be said about the probable future behavior of students? And this information is desirable not only for the student body as a whole, but for the individual student. Will he flunk out? Will he persist? Will he major in engineering? Will he accelerate? Will he become a disciplinary problem? or a variety of similar questions. This is the kind of information needed to provide valid guidelines in curricular planning, guidance and placement, and to make enlightened administrative decisions about the student with reference to such programs and functions as honors, scholarships, remedial courses, reduced class loads and the like.

A third kind of research information has to do with the impact and effect of experimental activities. These may result from the kinds of studies I alluded to earlier, or they may flow from broader, more comprehensive research activities.

A college, and, in particular, I suspect, its

personnel staff, attempt to manipulate the students' college environment to make it increasingly more effective with reference to educational growth and development. Thus, experiments do take place. For example, introducing intellectual inter-related programs in dormitory life, requiring counseling of probationary students, or the provision of student-faculty forums for a variety of purposes. The types of such manipulative devices need to be limited only by the imagination of the staff. The important thing to keep in mind, however, is that such manipulative activity should be regarded as experimental and should lead to evaluations and actions taken in accordance with such experimental activities.

At this point, let me assert that I question the degree to which small or even struggling middle-sized institutions can or will engage in institutional research. The large institutions, of course, have the necessary resources, in most cases, and they can take care of themselves. But not so the smaller or less well endowed schools. That is why I believe nationwide testing programs that include research activities -- for example the Educational Testing Service or the American College Testing Program -- have a useful role to play with regard to institutional research. What is more, certain advantages accrue from such research programs, because they can be much more comprehensive, norms can be established, based on large scale participation, they are repeated on an annual basis, and they are highly efficient. The participating institutions derive a great deal of information about themselves and their students, and also about themselves in comparison with other institutions.

And because we recognize that individual institutional research needs vary widely, provision is made for local research flexibility in a variety of forms, be it punch cards, magnetic tapes or whatnot, so that the local institution is enabled to go beyond the research performed by the national program.

Thus, in the case of the American College Testing Program, for example, not only does the participating college obtain a standard research descriptive service in the form of comprehensive profile, but it can use its punch cards or tapes to carry out such local studies as discovering differences between the most able and the least able students, in-state versus out-of-state students, intellectually oriented versus vocationally oriented students, working versus non-working students, single versus married students, Greeks versus non-Greeks, and so on. These are valuable descriptive services which an institution might otherwise be unable to obtain. Moreover, participation



in such a program provides a college with certain predictive information. Such information, however, can be an invaluable tool for guidance, sectioning, and other administrative programs, and for a variety of classification functions.

With reference to experimental effects mentioned earlier, each of the national programs pursue some areas of experimentation. In the case of A.C.T., for example, our developmental research staff has been working this past year on a follow-up device which will have practical utility, we hope, in assessing student growth and development (for example, changes in the student's aspirations, interests, values, non-academic accomplishments and the like), and in evaluating certain aspects of the total college experience. In other words, national programs offer certain advantages, but because there are local differences among institutions we make no pretense at offering a complete institutional research program. We do try to offer those elements of such a program which can be reasonably well standardized, so the benefits of mass production can be realized, and there is a strong advantage in having comparative data for similar institutions.

By taking on these relatively routine and recurring elements, we hope to free the institutional research people for more creative, less routine work.

Finally, whatever role in all this the student personnel administrator may play, it is to be hoped that he will have a significant role in synthesizing data and in making local interpretations and local applications. This is what I think the speakers had in mind this morning in referring to a profession. Research has to do with this body of knowledge which in this case is the special and professional concern of the student personnel people. Indeed, this is a major institutional responsibility, and our frequent failures in this respect constitute a major reason, I suspect, why research has as yet not had sufficient impact on educational practice.

Figures and data simply do not interpret themselves. We are aware of this, and increasing responsibility lies before us.

Let me now, in the few minutes remaining to me, attempt to summarize what I have said. I have said that because he always lacks time and sometimes the expertise, it is probably unrealistic to expect the student personnel administrator to perform much in the way of institutional research. I have defined institutional research as that research pertaining to the facilitation of decision making at the institutional or

institution-wide level. While this does not eliminate research involving the student body, it does exclude one time studies based on segments of the student body or studies related to the solution or attempted solution of day to day problems in the life of the student personnel administrator. These I have defined as routine administrative activities, and I am prepared to defend this position.

I have attempted to suggest, however, the student personnel administrators should depend upon certain categories of research to sustain their day to day efforts to enhance the educational growth and development of students. These I have classified as descriptive information, predictive information, and information derived from experimental procedures. I have also acknowledged that some of each of these will be derived from local enterprise, and I have asserted that at least for some institutions this research, or its effects, may well derive from research done independently and on a national scale.

I have asserted that research done on a national scale has the advantages of efficiency, low cost, of comparability between similar and diverse institutions, of comparability based on nationwide norms extracted annually from a nationwide program of testing and analysis, and of relieving local institutional researchers of demands on their time with reference to routine or recurring problems, in place of creative and novel treatment of problems unique to that individual institution.

I have suggested that national research programs exist which accomodate both demands mentioned above, (national and comparative data, and stimulus for further local research) but because local situations vary widely, I have suggested the benefits of having a national program as a center focus for institutional research but deriving local research benefits from the derivatives and offshoots of such research.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN HANSMEIER: Dr. Cross is up next.

DR. K. PATRICIA CROSS (Director of College and University Programs, Educational Testing Service): There was a point in my preparation of my portion of today's program when I had quite a lengthy introduction analyzing the problems of research in student personnel administration, why there was not more of it, why it was not better, and why it did not seem to make much impact on the practice of student personnel administration. I scrapped that introduction when I recalled my own years as Dean of Students at Cornell

University, when I occasionally longed to jump on the band wagon of brilliant critics and analysts and forsake my own rather prosaic role as the plodding administrator simply trying to find some answers.

Although your Program Committee has been gallant enough to leave the way open for analysis, rather than to take the task of proposing solutions, I think I must confess I probably have been conditioned to the slow search for answers. And I have been engaged, over the last three years, in attempting to work on a very small, very partial answer to what I think is the major reason for lack of good institutional research on the part of college administrators.

It does not take too much acumen, I think, for anyone who has ever served in college administration, to recognize that the bad guy responsible for the lack of significant institutional zeal of study and research is the hectic pace of almost all college administrators. If, following good administrative principles, we could simply delegate the time-consuming chores of designing instruments and tabulating and analyzing data, we could perhaps take some giant steps forward in personnel research. And I think the time for this progress is now.

Within recent years research centers have certainly blossomed throughout the country. The U.S. Office of Education, the many foundations, and other national agencies, such as the American College Testing Program and Educational Testing Service, have allotted, really, millions of dollars to research and development in higher education. These centers have a raft of highly trained people whose job is research. They never talk with a national fraternity officer, they have no concern with parietal rules except to study them as a phenomenon of sociological change. They can close off their offices to the telephone and to the student with an emergency. They ought, certainly, to be able to assist greatly in providing research help which has as its goal the improvement of programs of higher education.

Or let us take the question of data analysis. Nationally and regionally there are data-hungry computers that can outdo the most eager of part time graduate assistants in efficient data tabulation. And lest, at this point, you start to settle back and think "I can never compete with all of this in institutional research," let me assure you that it is my intention to convince you that indeed you should be doing research -- but research of a particular kind and in a specific role. I think maybe Jim Sours would make his point that we do not call this research. I

am inclined to call it research, and the kind of research that student personnel administrators ought to be doing.

This brings me, not without some effort on my part to steer it in this direction, to the title of this seminar. I believe that the proper role of the student personnel administrator in research lies not so much in basic research investigation as in research administration, and particularly in educational application. The dean's interest is not primarily concerned with the statistical significance of research but rather with its educational significance. Specifically, I am advocating student personnel leadership in the applied research which provides the information for decisions about local campus programs. If there is anything we really have discovered in all our research in higher education it is that colleges and the students attending those colleges are remarkably diverse.

What is needed by college administrators, I think, is information about the particular students on their particular campus.

While research specialists can design the instruments, and they can analyze the data, the responsibility for interpretation and educational application cannot be delegated.

I would like to focus, after this afternoon, on one type of research that can, and, I think, should be done by college administrators. This emphasis should not be interpreted, certainly, as disparaging in any way the efforts of those of you who are pursuing interesting hypotheses or the valuable contributions individual members or NASPA as an organization are making to the advancement of knowledge in the field. But I would like to be very specific in attempting to illustrate one model for administering a local program of research with a minimum of time spent in gathering, processing and analyzing data, leaving the maximum time for interpretation and application.

The data which I will present is an actual case study of one of the colleges participating in the Institutional Research Program for Higher Education. The Institutional Research Program, or IRPHE, as we call it for short, is a non-profit research program launched last year by E.T.S. to help colleges and universities study their students in their campus environment. In its first year IRPHE has served over 150 colleges, surveying some 42,000 students in a great variety of locally conducted self-study programs.

The Institutional Research Program has really three major purposes. The first is to identify, or, if

necessary, to design useful research instruments. The second is to provide efficient mass tabulation of data. And the third, to provide professional research consulting services through workshops, publications, speaking, campus visits, and so forth.

I think it is with mixed feelings that I report that although IRPHE provides mostly information which is specifically the domain of the student personnel administrator the academic administrators have been considerably ahead of the student personnel administrators in taking leadership on their campus. I say "mixed feelings" because while I am happy to see academic administrators take an interest in the impact of the total educational program on the student I think the student personnel deans are losing valuable leadership in their area of special concern by not being the office on their campus with the information about students and their educational environment.

I would like to look now at the type of information furnished by two instruments of particular interest, I think, to student personnel administrators. These instruments are the College Student Questionnaires, CSQ, and CUES, the College and University Environment Scales.

The data used in this case study this afternoon are from a small, highly selective, private co-educational four year liberal arts college. I selected this college primarily because we had fairly complete data on it, and also because it was not too atypical in any way.

Let me talk first about the study of its overall environment as its students perceived it.

Many of you, I think, are familiar with the College and University Environment Scales, called CUES for short, which was developed by Dr. Robert Pace of UCLA. Very briefly, CUES consists of 150 true-false questions about the college. In about twenty minutes the student can mark whether he thinks each statement is true or false about the college he is attending. If two-thirds of the students agree on a statement, then it is assumed that this is a perceivable aspect of the college environment. Note that with this instrument it is the college that receives the score and not the student. We can look at CUES data in two ways: the profile of the college on the five scales, or an item by item analysis of the response of students.

If you look at the first chart, the sort of paragraph there, you will see that this represents two administrations of CUES. The shaded line shows the responses of entering freshmen as they expect the

college to be. Then, the solid line represents the college as it actually is on the five CUES scales when seen by the same students after they have had a year of experience on the campus.

Well, it is immediately apparent in this case that For Real College (the mythical name of this college) did not live up to students' expectations in any of the five scales. And this is very typical. There are very few colleges that can live up to student expectations. And they just simply are not as stimulating and as exciting as students dream they will be. But the patterns of expectations and actual experience do show considerable variation from campus to campus.

Students obviously expect this campus to be a friendly place, as indicated by their giving it a 99th percentile rating on Community, which is a group of items focused on the friendly atmosphere, the opportunity to talk with other students, the opportunity to talk with professors, the group activities on the campus. And the college catalog does emphasize this feature, so the students might well have expected this to be one of the outstanding characteristics of the college. The first paragraph of their catalog reads as follows: "'For Real' is an independent co-educational and residential liberal arts college. Enrollment is limited because of the conviction that smallness in a college has the special virtue of a closely knit student body and cordial relations between faculty and students." And in all of the data this afternoon I think you will see this theme running through the evaluation of this college. As a matter of fact, they do pretty well at accomplishing this goal. Upon a year's acquaintance with the college students still rate it at 87th percentile on the Community scale. I think this college, if this is one of their major goals, as it obviously is, is doing a pretty good job of establishing a community spirit on the campus.

If you will look at the bottom line on the chart you will see that students also have high expectations for scholarship at For Real College. Although it too fails to come up to expectations, it still ranks in the upper half of representative colleges after the students have had a year of experience.

The Guide to American Colleges, by Katz and Biernbaum, rates For Real as very selective in admissions, and notes that over half the freshmen are from the top quarter of their high school class, and thus it is not very surprising to find they have high expectations for a scholarly atmosphere at the college.

Now let us look at the next page, where I have simply taken some items from the CUES scale and

illustrated what is happening there. Since time is limited this afternoon and I simply want to give you an overall idea of what is possible, let us look again at the two scales, Community and Scholarship. The first two items in the Community scale, items 37 and 34, show some reason for the drop from expectations to actual. The college catalog, as I read it, did indeed say that the history and traditions of the college were strongly emphasized, and yet when students got there, although 81 percent of them expected this to be sort of a continuing emphasis of the college, only 57 percent of them found this to be actually the case.

If I were interested as a personnel administrator in establishing a high community atmosphere on my campus, I think I would be very pleased with the students' responses to question 119. Although 98 percent of them expected the college to help them get acquainted, the fact that 88 percent of them found this speaks very well for the community aspect of the college, and maybe for the orientation program.

Scholarship -- if you drop down to scale 5 there, and these are the items on scale 5 -- we find something I would call, I think, academic disillusionment at this college. Students have found indeed that learning what is in the textbook probably is enough to pass most courses, and they have found that class discussions are not typically vigorous and intense. However, they have found, as illustrated by the last questions, that students who work hard for high grades are likely to be in. That is, students do work hard for high grades at this college.

The research for this, as far as the student personnel administrator is concerned, is very simple. I think one of the major questions comes here. That is in the selection of an instrument which will tell you some things which you want to know about your campus. So first he selected the instrument. He arranged for its administration, twenty minutes in September and twenty minutes in March. He packed up his answer sheets and sent them off to E.T.S., who returned them to him in much the same way you see here; that is, with the complete data analyzed.

The real work, I think, comes where it should for the administrator-educator, and that is after he has received back the report; then it is his job to interpret it and apply it to improve the educational program at his institution.

Whereas CUES attempts to give a picture of the climate of the college, the College Student Questionnaires, or CSQ, which is a brand new instrument

introduced just this year, is designed to describe the student, his background, his plans, his attitudes and reactions to his college experience. College Student Questionnaires come in two forms, CSQ 1 and CSQ 2. CSQ 1 is for the entering student who has had no experience on the campus. CSQ 2 is for any enrolled undergraduate. Part 2 focuses, of course, on his experiences as a student on that campus, but there are overlapping scales, so that it will enable longitudinal research studying possible changes on campus. Q's is a very flexible instrument and provides sort of an overall omnibus description of the student and his reactions. It takes an hour to administer. It consists of 200 questions, and, like CUES, it is scored, tabulated and recorded by E.T.S.

Now, in chart 3 I have selected just some of the items from CSQ 1 and CSQ 2. These, again, are given in terms of percentages of students giving the response.

CSQ 1, in this instance, was administered in September, of course, and then CSQ 2 on this campus was administered in March, or spring, to the same students, after they had had roughly nine months of study on the campus.

Now, if you will look at the first item there -- and I am not going to discuss all of these items because I think if we go through one or two you will see the kind of information that is available. Again, I think if you will look at the total flavor on this page without talking particularly about statistical significance, there is again the idea that one picks up that there is a certain amount of academic disillusionment. Students came in, 33 percent of them, expecting their course work in general to be the greatest satisfaction they would find at college. Only 9 percent of them found this to be the case.

But then look at the second alternative there. This, by the way -- my 1, 7 and 9 there indicate that there were 9 alternatives. I simply picked out these as perhaps being of more interest for analysis than the others there. These were not the only three choices, in other words.

Students did not expect, generally, for close friendships with fellow students to be their greatest satisfaction at college. Only 3 percent of them had that expectation. And yet, look, 27 of them stated that this was their greatest satisfaction at this college.

Again this data would tend to support the CUES data. This college was apparently pretty strong on



community relations.

This particular college happens to have a very high proportion of students who are seeking self discovery and self insight. The national norms run around 15 percent of the students expecting this to be their greatest satisfaction. Well, this college has 38 percent, and, as a matter of fact, I think do unusually well in providing this type of satisfaction for the students; 38 percent of them expected it, 34 percent of them actually found this their greatest satisfaction.

If you look at the next three or four items there you will see again the thing I am talking about, the academic disillusionment. Item 56 is, of course, not on part 1 of the questionnaire, because it has to do with college experience. But 43 percent of those students were enjoying their courses less than they had expected or else were mildly disappointed. 62 percent were very dissatisfied with their grades this year. 69 percent felt that grades this past year either grossly or slightly under represented their ability.

While this seems quite high, students in general feel that their ability is underestimated by grades. In our national norms we have almost half the students saying that it is an underestimate of their ability. Whether this is due to and would be increased by this college being highly selective -- that is, you are going to have A students from high school probably going into the new competition and receiving C's -- it may reflect that, or it may reflect something that is going on in their classrooms. I do not think we can tell from this information. So follow-up information is needed here.

On the other hand, students at this college have learned to attach more importance to grades than they did when they entered. They entered with what I would call a slightly idealistic hope. Only 19 percent of them thought that a great deal of importance should be attached to good grades. 41 percent of them were convinced of this by the end of the year.

The national norms go the other way. 36 percent expect grades to be important. 25 percent find it so. So this would be something this college might take a look at. They did not find it nearly as competitive as they had thought they might.

Again, I think item 30 may have some bearing on the academic disillusionment. Whereas originally in their expectations the women chose housewife with children and married career women with children in about

equal proportion, the women were a little more convinced that they would prefer to be a housewife than a career woman by the end of the year.

I just want to call your attention, now, to perhaps two items on the next page. Item 137 is of a good deal of interest. Institutions of higher education have for a long, long time, with the exception of some institutions, been called godless institutions. It is not true as far as the national norms go. But certainly something is happening at this college, where the question really was "With what frequency have you attended religious services in the past year?" Well, this would be indicated that almost half of the entering students had attended religious services once a week or more as high school students, and that drops to only 17 percent at this institution. Here again is something we probably cannot tell from here; whether it is the fact that this very small town in which this college is located does not have the opportunity for many denominations, I do not know.

The next question would indicate that the students are not particularly shaken up about their personal philosophy or religious faith. 72 percent of them still feel adequate in this department.

The next statements give you something of an idea about the type of statement that appears in the CSQ. I would like, lastly, to call your attention to item 34. Obviously, the students have found this college considerably more expensive than they thought it would be. Only 21 percent of them expected to spend over \$3,000. 54 percent had found themselves doing so by the end of the year. Whether this is research or just something to help in administrative planning, it seems to me if you had found this one thing and had done something about the college catalog on the expectations of college expenses, one might consider this research worthwhile.

While I have not time here to go into any real detail on the use of College Student Questionnaires, let me just mention some of the other features which I think make the instrument particularly useful to college personnel people. One of the features I find very exciting but cannot seem to get administrators to use very well is the provision for analyzing sub-groups on the campus. For example, one might wish to study differences in dormitory residence versus fraternity members versus students living off campus. This can very easily be done. All the student does is grade where he lives, and then your report comes back tabulated with the percentage in each of these sub-groups indicating the percentage that gave the particular response to the question. These come back indicating all

of the item alternatives, as well as the College Student Questionnaire scales, which I will not even take time to describe, but they are listed on the last page of your handout.

Of some interest to you will be four scales on the part 2, which are called Satisfaction with Faculty, Satisfaction with Administration, Satisfaction with their Fellow Students, and Satisfaction with their Major Field of Study. CSQ also provides a write-your-own-item section where the college can write items which are of particular local interest and receive back from E.T.S. the complete tabulation of student response to these items. One might wish to know, for example, how many students would like to live in the new dorm next year, or what student reactions were to the orientation program that fall. This too could be designed by you but tabulated by E.T.S.

The possibilities for data collection are limitless with the variety of new instruments and data processing services now available. CSQ and CUES are certainly not the only instruments available. I state these because I have data and because I am familiar with the instruments, and because I think they are promising, but one of the great services I would think NASPA or other professional organizations might serve is to gather all the instruments that are becoming rapidly available to you, from all kinds of publishers, research centers and research foundations, describe them a little bit, tell what you could do with them, and where you could get further information about them. This would certainly ease the business of busy college administrators doing research. But I do hope such delegation of responsibility for carrying out research, carried in part by the local college, and in part by national organizations and research specialists, will help to bring research possibilities into the practical planning of educational programs. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN HANSMEIER: Thank you very much, Pat and Jim. We have heard two erudite presentations. It seems to me that the greatest simplification would be to say that both Pat and Jim advocated that student personnel administrators facilitate their efforts in research by using commercially prepared instruments national in scale so that they do not have to worry through the preparation of the instruments.

While you were talking, Pat, I had the feeling that it is relatively easy for the student personnel administrator to find out what is on his campus, and then I was wondering how the student personnel administrator goes from what is to what he would want to be. I think this is the crux of the problem, and one we have

never really gotten to. How do you really change behavior, which is the crux of all education?

And, Jim, I think you and Pat had somewhat different definitions of what institutional research is. I think you made the distinction between studies and institutional research. I wondered if, based on this difference, you would like to comment on this?

At any rate, as promised, I would like to give Pat and Jim the chance to interchange a little bit before we throw it open to the audience.

DR. CROSS: I will respond to the first part of Tom's question. That is, I think he is quite right that one can find out what is about the campus. This is where I tossed the challenge, that this is, to me, the responsibility of the personnel administrator, and in cooperation with his colleagues in the administration, to determine what ought to be. There are lots of colleges which could not care less about community, for instance, and would be upset that the major rating of the students at this college was community, and that it was not scholarship instead.

The evaluation comes after the fact gathering process, and I am not sure we can help very much with that truly difficult problem except to free the college administrator to do this kind of task and let the efficient national programs and so forth take care of some of the routine that would free him for making the educational decisions, which is part of what to me makes the student personnel administration an educational profession.

DR. SOURS: Well, I will pick it up where she left off. In answer to the second part of your question, I would agree that finding out what is is perhaps a relatively easy job in comparison to finding out how you get from where you are to where you want to be. There is an intermediate step I think we are overlooking here, and that is a community decision by not only the student personnel administrator, who has a professional concept about where his institution ought to be, but a persuasive influence exercised in part by the student personnel people in conversations with others at the institution, including faculty, and perhaps students, about where the institution wants to be.

I think the articulation of institutional goals is a community responsibility. I think to some extent the selection then, subsequently, of means appropriate toward the fulfillment of the goals is also a matter for some degree of community determination, at least in its broader guidelines.

About the quibble here as to whether or not a study is research or whether research of an institutional kind -- institutional-wide kind -- embraces the compilation of demographic facts and so on, I suppose this is the relatively unimportant aspect of this conversation. I do feel, however, that administrators have an obligation to informed decisions, and the compilation of facts for the purpose of forming decisions does not necessarily -- we do not have to cloak it with the term research. Sometimes this is an ego-building vocabulary that I think is misleading.

CHAIRMAN HANSMEIER: We would like to give you people a chance now to question and to comment.

... A question and answer period followed ...

---

## SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

### "The Student Personnel Administrator and Student Involvement in Community Affairs"

Seminar, meeting in the Colonial Room,  
convened at two o'clock, James E. Quigley, Dean of  
Men, University of Colorado, presiding.

CHAIRMAN QUIGLEY: So that we can adhere to  
the time schedule set up for us, I think we should  
get under way. Our topic is "The Student Personnel  
Administrator and Student Involvement in Community  
Affairs." I am a last minute stand-in for my boss,  
Dr. Glen Barnett, who could not be here because he is  
involved with the Sigma Chi lawsuit at the University  
of Colorado. So I am here in his place. My name is  
Jim Quigley. I am Dean of Men at the University of  
Colorado, and it is our privilege to have with us  
Professor Howard Higman, from the Sociology Department  
of the University of Colorado, a gentleman I have  
known for a long time, both from the other side of the  
lectern, as a student, and I think as a colleague.

I can testify to the fact that not only is  
he one very fine teacher -- at least he made me sweat  
in class -- but he is one of the best practitioners I  
know in the field of sociology. His classroom extends  
very far beyond the confines of the University campus  
into the community and into society, and I think his  
students very much look to him as a person who is in-  
volved with the problems of our communities and our  
societies and our young people.

Just very briefly, he came to the University  
of Colorado in 1946, doing his graduate studies at the  
University of Colorado. At the present time he is  
Director of Action Research in Socialization Processes,  
Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.  
He is currently training VISTA volunteers, and, as you  
know, this is the domestic peace corps.

This is the third session, I believe, you  
have completed in that regard, Howard.

He is also well known on our campus, and I  
think throughout the country, for his initiation and  
development of our Conference on World Affairs, which  
started way back in the 1940's. At least on our campus  
this is one of the highlights of the year in terms of  
bringing distinguished intellectuals and speakers from  
all over the country to talk about issues in higher  
education in their society.

As a kind of introduction for the program, before I say any more about Howard, I would like to read a statement -- it is not really a statement, I guess; it is an introduction to an article, written by one of our students at the University in a review of the collegiate press, which talks about, in part, this area of student involvement in community affairs, and talks about, I guess some of the motivations, perhaps, for students in wanting to get out of the ivory tower of the university.

This was an introduction in an article explaining the reasons for the development of our clearing house project, which is a social service project of the University, and this is what he says. This is a student, and I quote: "A full scale revolution, sometimes violent, often subtle, is sweeping its way through the ivory sprinkled and textbook littered realm of the American university student. That revolution promises to erase the traditional Hollywood stereotype of the frivolous and useless college student and replace it with a new, far more realistic image: that of an intelligent, aware and useful member of society. Like all revolutions, this massive student movements feeds on the desires and dissatisfactions of its followers. Its influence has been felt in the State Department, via the teach-ins, its muscles have been flexed in Alabama and Mississippi, and its dissatisfaction has erupted into riots and demonstrations at Berkeley. Bored with building homecoming decorations and playing the student government game, this new breed of student is eagerly searching for new areas of involvement. He wishes to supplement, if not replace, the classroom with actual work in an area where learning comes from experience instead of it being exhumed from musty textbooks. The successes and failures of the past few years have proven to the students that they can play a significant role in society, provided they seize the initiative and plunge forward. The responsible student, however, is interested in something more than a chance to air his dirty laundry before the burghers of the community. He wants an opportunity to use and sharpen his skills in a way that will benefit both himself and society."

I think Reverend Greeley gave us a very fine analysis this morning of this new breed, and he left with one very, I think, preponderant and fundamental question of why. I think Professor Higman will attempt to give us at least some of his answers in this regard.

Howard.

PROFESSOR HOWARD HIGMAN (Professor of Sociology, University of Colorado): Thank you, Jim.

I am going to devote most of my time to pure theory, and deal with the question, as I see it, of why I thought Father Greeley's remarks this morning were very correct. I am going to give you, therefore, to begin with, what I call a heuristic.

I understand we will have some time for questions and discussion afterward. I like that, because then I can be categorical and unqualified, and then in the question period, of course, I can take back the things I have said that seem to be most offensive. So I am not going to be very cautious or careful.

I think of a heuristic as simply an idea which is not true, probably, but enables one to see more clearly things that are true even though it isn't.

Well, I will say this: I think one might make the statement that these students live in a time which does not exist. I phrase this "There is no now." And I will try to explain to you what I mean by that.

Usually there is a now; there is a place in which you live. We have the idea of discontinuity in history. Things change a little bit at a time, and the present is connected to the past, and the present is connected to the future. That is the normal situation. The present is just slightly different from the past, and the future slightly different from the present.

My argument here is that occasionally in history events occur which disconnect the past from the future, and if one is around at that time he is nowhere. We do not see it when we are there, of course. I remember I learned that Rome fell in 429 A.D., or something, and I had visions of everyone going to bed one night, then waking in the middle of the night to a terrible clatter, everyone running into the streets shouting "What is happening?" and hearing someone answer "Rome is falling." Of course, if you were there, you would not have noticed it. In fact, I know a fellow in Rome today who does not know that Rome has fallen yet. (Laughter)

Those of you with children have had this experience, because we all know they are concrete things. They are babies, and they are little kids, and they are gangly teen-agers, and then they are very young men and women, and they seem in our minds to be discrete things. But day by day they do not change. They are no different Tuesday than they were Monday. How did they get so different when they are ten than they were when they were five?

In my own experience, I have had children who



even went backwards. I mean they had been young ladies on the front of the week, and teen-agers on Saturday.

So what we are saying is when you are there you do not see it. But it is necessary to see it to understand things. It is like a movie film. You look at two pieces of it two yards away, and they are very different frames, but you look at the frames next to each other and they are essentially the same frame.

I am going to argue that we have had four times in history when there has been such a huge revolution that the past has disconnected from the future. If I were a materialist -- we in the Western world tend to be either materialists or idealists, and I am neither or both. If I were a materialist, I would phrase this in terms of the use of energy. If I were an idealist, I would refer to it in terms of communications.

I would say that the first revolution occurred 175 million years ago, we think now. Anthropologists are always digging up something new in Tanganyika and moving the date back, so it will continuously move back, but meanwhile that is a current good date. It separates life called animal life and life called human life.

The revolution in the use of energy was the use of tools. All animals up until that time only had the energy of the levers built into their bodies, in their arms and legs and back and claws and jaws to use for self defense or for industry. The use of tools involved rocks, missiles and levers. And a lever, as you know, is simply the first ape that took a log and put it over another log, stood on the long end of the one and exerted ten times as much energy up as he did down. He was by that act materially a man. Or, put another way, the first ape that got the idea of picking up a rock and throwing it and hitting a lion squarely between the eyes, knocking him cold, when he was vastly weaker than the lion, he was by that act a man.

Ideally, the invention that separates man and animal is language. We speak of animals as having language; they do not, they communicate. We have a study at Cornell about the communication system of chickens. They discovered these animals have something like thirteen words. "Here comes the hawk; jiggers. The water trough is full. There's corn here. Here comes the rooster." (Laughter) This is not technically language, in the sense of symbolic language. Symbolic language involves representations that are neither here nor now, and unfortunately things that are sometimes not at all. But the invention of speech, symbolic language, marks the difference between man and animal ideally. Phrased in a quick phrase, whether you believe it or not, dogs cannot make appointments.

Now, this went on for about 175 million years essentially unchanged, and the son's life was like the father's, the father's like the grandfather's, until about 10,000 years ago, we think, somewhere between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, a second revolution of great magnitude occurred. The revolution in energy was the use of what can be symbolized by the wheel and the horse. Whether it is an ox or an elephant or a dog it is the animal -- biological explosions in muscles, occurring in other animals, under the direction of man. Couple that with the wheel and you have the chariot, and you have Syria and the Babylonians, and you have hundreds of times more power in the hands of those with the tools than those without them.

In the area of communications, of course, the revolution was the invention of writing. Writing makes possible putting down the recipes for survival, and thus tolerating change, and an extension of the group way beyond that which the human voice can hear. You can send a yeoman in the upper and lower kingdom, and this gives rise to civilization, which means warfare, class, luxury, science, art and slavery. And this goes along, until about 400 years ago, pretty much unchanged.

About 400 years ago we had our third revolution. The third revolution in power is the use of energy outside biological muscles. All energy up to that time had been some form of biological explosions. You can symbolize this by gun powder, if you like, by the use of fossil fuel, oil, coal, kerosene. The gasoline airplane is an illustration of this kind of energy. It multiplied the factor of man's energy now at his command, for war or peace, by tens of thousands of times.

The revolution in communications, of course, is printing. Printing made possible universal literacy. So right after the invention of printing people ran around in England and tacked up political attacks on telephone poles, and that is the cause of the rise of the House of Commons, and democracy, and the life you and I and our grandparents, and our great grandparents knew. It may be symbolized in our minds for the discussion today by the words of Louisa May Alcott, "Little Men" and "Little Women."

For 400 years we had this. Now, at the current time in the world, we have had two revolutions again, since the time that I was born, if you are practical. If you are theoretical you would say the material revolution was dated 1905, when Albert Einstein stated the laws of the equivalence of mass and energy, the theory of relativity. If you are practical about it you would say -- I take the date March 1st, 1954, when the United States detonated the hydrogen bomb, the material equivalent of which exceeded the sum total of

every explosion of every man in every civilization in every century throughout the whole history of time. On the 28th day of February, 1954, there had been so much explosion in the history of the world. The next day, in one detonation, that sum was exceeded. So, all energy up to that point had come from some form of sunlight, whether it was water power, wind power, fossil fuel, vegetable oil, or animal. It was sunlight in some form. And for the first time we have a source of energy that is not from the center of the sun. It rises from the center of the atom. Nuclear fission and fusion. This, as we all know and are tired of hearing about, multiplies the energy factor by now millions of times that man has to bring for peace or war in his world.

The revolution in communications is, of course, electronic communications -- electronic circuitry. Now again man can, as he could in primitive days, suddenly see or hear one man simultaneously all over the world. It is my own opinion that there has been nothing happen that was so great and so important in the history of the world as one day when men in Russia, and Poland, and Nigeria, and France, and Chile, and Brazil, and Japan and Minnesota simultaneously saw another man shoot another man dead in a hallway in a jail in Dallas, Texas. The editorials that appeared around the world were strangely similar in their content, whether they were in Swahili or Russian or Polish or French or Japanese or English or German. They had in their content a strangely human characteristic rather than, as was said this morning, an ideological characteristic. They were not Buddhist editorials, or communist editorials, or capitalist editorials, or Revisionist editorials, or Trotskyite editorials, or Henry George editorials; they were strangely similar.

I guess I am revealing that I kind of think the communications side of the picture is, if I had to choose -- I do not have to choose, so I won't -- but if I had to choose I would choose to say that the communications factors are the more important of the two. I think the electronic circuitry and the communications is by far the most important thing. The bomb is important, but I think the knowledge is more important.

I am fond of an old saying that what you don't know will not make you angry. We have to realize that until now man has always lived almost totally oblivious to the way people lived elsewhere. Even though a few Englishmen went to India, the mass of Indians, for hundreds of years, under England, never saw an Englishman. They lived in a village and never went twenty miles away. They never heard anything but a rumor or a folk tale about the city. They were used to a high death rate and a high birth rate, and this was normal. Being normal, it is tolerable.

This year, in the Sierra Leone, out of ten children born in Africa eight will die before the year is up from lack of food and lack of medicine. Only two out of ten will make it to twelve months of age. They tend not to even name the child until it is three or four because the likelihood of it not surviving is greater than the other. This is normal, and it is not very disturbing. But if you run into a situation in which you do know, then you can become quite angry. Say I go out here on the lawn and run into a fellow, and he says "I'm from Mars." And I say "Oh. How old are you?" He says "683 million years old." And I say "Oh, really, what do you mean? Don't you die?" He says "Die? Of course not. We discovered the cause of death; it's water. We drink bourbon." (Laughter)

Now, what I am saying is my mother died two years ago at the age of 94. I did not fall apart. Ninety-four is a pretty good life span in my opinion. I sort of doubt if I will make it. But if I learned that death was not necessary, that there were people who did not die, I would be livid with rage. There are all kinds of people I would like to talk to. I would like to talk to Aristotle and Adam Smith. I have some very special questions to ask Sigmund Freud. (Laughter) I resent missing these guys. But I regard it as normal.

What I am trying to say is that the whole world is learning suddenly that the normal high death rate and high birth rate is not a necessary or a technologically necessary fact. For every person in Africa we do not have medicine or drugs for you and I know we and the Russians together have, combined, an atomic arsenal which is the equivalent of ten tons for each one of them. So we have ten tons of T.N.T. for each one of them, but no penicillin or pabulum. That is simply a fact of the world.

There is a question as to whether or not we can live as an island of luxury in a world of starvation when it is not technologically necessary and survive. The French did not figure that out in 1789. You remember Marie Antoinette? She was the secretary of the local John Birch Society, (laughter) and when they said they were hungry she said "Let them eat cake," and they chopped off their heads.

These things, I think, are terribly relevant to what we are calling here at this Conference the new breed of students. I am saying, historically, another thing. This is sort of Hegelian. We tend to get reality from contrast; two sides to an argument; a thing and its opposite. It is my observation that right now in the dialog in the United States the argument is totally missing from the eyes of a student. As he looks up at

the argument he does not see the argument. The reason I say he does not see it is that it is not there.

I am pretty sure of everything I have said up to now, in case you want to know where I am weak. (Laughter) What I am saying next I am not sure of, and if you feel the need to browbeat me, this is the safer place.

We heard this morning that this is an anti-ideological group. I think it is right, and I think we can figure out why and how it is.

In the first place, we divide ideologies into two categories: moderate and radical. Radical ideologies are called that because they advocate change at the roots. They would pick up the free and destroy it and start over. Moderate ideologies preserve and seek to play the game within the rules. Moderate ideologies are associated with the politics invented and developed in Scandinavia, the low countries, England, Canada, the United States, New Zealand and Australia. This, incidentally, is the free world we have not lost.

Well, we have never had a tradition of moderate dialectical politics in Germany or in Italy, or Asia, or Latin America or anywhere. This is an aside, but it is so disturbing to hear people talking about going around losing the free world, you know, that we never had. Now, in fact, it has extended slightly. We can add Japan, if not Pakistan.

The moderates tend to be divided into two groups which are currently called liberal and conservative. Historically, those of you know that the word moderate was the word liberal. So I have drawn a little bunch of six boxes up here, and I am going to characterize them this way: The reason the liberals and the conservatives are not opposite is that they are not opposite. Liberal means free, and liberals tend to be concerned with freeing people.

Ideally, the people who would run against liberals would be called enslavers, but nobody runs on the enslaving ticket. (Laughter) So the liberals do not really have an opposition. (Laughter)

Then we have conservatives. Conservative means to save or keep. Ideally, the people opposite the conservatives would be called the wastrels. So no one runs on the wastrel ticket. (Laughter)

So here we have conservatives not running against wastrels, and liberals not running against enslavers; we call it an election. (Laughter) It works

very, very well, if you do not examine it logically. (Laughter) Of course, that is one of the things we learned from the British. That is why the French have always been in trouble; they are logical.

But the thing about it is -- well, I mean, imperfectly, a sort of a case can be made for it. You see, you are a liberal president, you get a telegram -- or a prime minister -- that says there is a shipment of army surplus on a siding in Georgia, of concrete, and if something is not done about it it will rain, and it will harden into rock, and there will be a scandal. The liberal says "Well, that is a shame. We ought to do something about it." And he files it. Then he gets a telegram saying there are some people being exploited as "wetbacks" in Arizona, so he sends Harry Hopkins out on the next plane to write a new law or do something about it. These keep piling up until all this concrete does get wet. So he is out of office, and you get a conservative. He gets a telegram, and it says the navy has 10,000 surplus buttons due to a change in trouser design; they are in Milwaukee. He says "That is ghastly; we'll have to sell them through army surplus instantly." He gets a letter saying somebody is being exploited in Lower Manhattan, making neckties. He says "No American should work like that. We ought to do something about it." So his letters pile up. Well, it vacillates back and forth, and it is a good system.

Now we have radicals of the right and radicals of the left. The difference between the radical of the right and the radical of the left is that the radical of the right seeks to root out the whole system and abolish the game and start all over again, to create some sort of a society which he imagines used to exist. I mean, you know, there are people around who think there used to be law and order in 1865, no crime on the streets in 1865. If we could just flash them back to the Barbary Coast of Chicago in 1865 they would think there is law and order on the streets today. You would not have dared go outside as a middle class female after five-thirty in 1865, on the streets. But this is the world they want to return to.

The radical of the left, of course, would root out the system, and what he does is he tends to take current trends and then project them into the future. Just for example, you could take the number of square inches on a woman's body that shows on a bathing beach, in 1765, 1865, 1900, 1930, 1965, and then you could make a projection as to how many inches will show in the year 2000. (Laughter) And the radical of the left would say "Let's do it now." (Laughter)

All right, now I really want to get quite serious. The radicals of the right, and the radicals of

the left. Now, the most extreme left wing radical position currently being presented to students is that their basic problem in the world is hunger. The next one is that the basic problem of the world is the bomb, war.

The liberal position of the moderate is to be identified with things like the League of Women Voters, the American Association for the United Nations, the American Friends Service Committee, with persons like Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson.

I had a terrible time the other day. I suddenly thought all the liberals are dead. I could not think of any examples other than Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Stevenson. There are all kinds of organizations.

Then the conservatives in the moderate position are for what is called arms control. These are persons who are men of good will, have government contracts, reside in political science departments, are acceptable to security restrictions of the federal government, and have expense accounts and go to universities and study arms control. You might say a couple of years ago you would have Stevenson in that box, and you would have McNamara in that box. I will still use those symbols over one's memory.

The radicals on the right now also define the world's problems. The first group are still in the 20's. They are persons, oftentimes refugees from Central Europe in America, going about making speeches, saying things like "If we are to preserve our eternal democracy --." (Laughter) Their problem is communism; if you can root out communism, you can save the world. They are remembering the fight between the Trotskyites and the Stalinists in the 30's, and liquidation of the labor movement in 1928, in Prague, and things like that. They are the people who say we lost China without having figured out whenever we'd gotten it. (Laughter)

Then the extreme radical right are persons who think the world's problem is population explosion, so the answer to the first problem there, of course, is food. The answer to the second one is universal disarmament, abolition of warfare. The answer to the moderate position is join the AAUN and sponsor foreign students. The answer to arms control is to study public administration. The answer to communism is to join the John Birch Society. And the answer to the population explosion is to join Planned Parenthood.

Now, I am really trying to come to a specific point. What I am arguing is this: I have watched persons from each of these six positions coming into the university and making a speech. The faculty and students

will universally applaud each of these six speeches, one Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and then you start over and do it again. Everybody is going around making these six speeches. Why is it dull? The reason it is dull is that the opposite of these six positions is missing in the world in which you and I live. Historically they were there, but they are not now. They are all ghosts, save maybe one. I will discuss those ghosts with you in a moment.

We heard this morning that students are anti-intellectual. Of course they are. There are no ideas to be intellectual about. Your ideas and mine are not any good. The arguments we had thirty years ago, before the revolution I am referring to, we had arguments on each of those points. There were two sides to each of those questions. The first one is hunger. Who is in favor of hunger in 1966? Who is making a speech pro hunger? Anti-hunger Monday, pro-hunger Tuesday. (Laughter)

Well, now you are laughing, you see, because you see it is perfectly ludicrous for anyone to say that hunger is good. But you must remember that for several hundred years, in the immediate past, people did say hunger was good. That idea has suddenly vanished. Who is that? That was the Right Reverend Thomas Robert Malthus, who thought hunger was good. We had the iron law of population, and he thought starvation was a necessary thing for the perfection of the germ plasm. Malthus was one of the most evil men I have ever known of. He sat in a mahogany room in England with green velvet drapes and hated people, and was terribly fearful about more being born. My favorite quote of his is the statement "I am an advocate of late marriage, but even with marriage postponed to the late age of 28, however difficult the deprivation may be borne by men, there is still time for a devastating torrent of children." (Laughter)

You remember Herbert Spencer, and what we called social Darwinism. We had the idea of the misuse of the Darwin theory of non-survival of the unfit, changing it to a new thing called survival of the fittest. The idea was that the germ plasm of the race would be maintained and preserved, created by the steady elimination of the weakest, by natural selection. The last time I heard anyone openly advocate that, I admit, openly, was in the 30's, when some people were opposing Franklin Roosevelt's dole on the grounds it would beget little relievers, who would beget still more little relievers, and still more little relievers, until half the world would be on relief.

This argument is not currently advanced, that we should eliminate by starvation the weak element of society. But that was historically the hunger position.



Now you come over to the bomb -- that is an abhorrence of the idea of war -- Selinas Pauling and others like him, and various organizations, the Sane Nuclear Policy, the movie "Doctor Strangelove;" what is the opposite of it? Advocating war. Again you live, for the first time, in a country in which nobody advocates war as an end in itself. I am fond of quoting a U.S. Associate Justice of the Supreme Court who said -- and play like Justice Warren said this, imagine his saying it -- "We need war. We need war at all times. We need war that men should not forget, in this time of French humor and fleshpots, for it is in war that heroism and altruism is born." Can you imagine Warren saying that in 1966? That was a quote from Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1870-something, when he, on Memorial Day, felt that his participation in the American Civil War had made a man out of him, that he had been a Boston dandy, and he went off to the Civil War and came home a man.

We have a whole literature that has existed up to now of not war to a means, not war to win or defeat an enemy, or even stop genocide in Germany, but war as a game, war as a good show. No one says that now. So again these boys abhorring war have no real viable opponent.

Okay, the internationalists; who is their opponent? He is also a ghost. The last ones I remember were Robert Taft and Herbert Hoover. Up to the end of World War II we had a waging argument in our society between what we called isolationism and interventionism. It was a real argument. Hoover and Taft proposed what was called the Gibraltar of the West for our policy following the war, that we pull back to our shores, build up our air force, tell the rest of the world to go hang but not bother us. There is nobody anywhere in the political spectrum now advocating isolationism. So here are all the interventionists and internationalists interventioning and internationaling, and no one is against them.

You can quibble over the day, how far you go north, how far you go south, whether you do it in Viet Nam, whether you do it in Santa Domingo, whether you do it in NATO, whether you do it with France. Those are all administrative details. The basic idea of being involved in the world is a settled argument, and the opposite is gone. The opposite of your arms control people is roughly the same as the Oliver Wendell Holmes argument. There is nobody in favor of arms non-control, blowing up bombs, and so on.

The ghost of communism is gone too, and this is the point on which I think I can expect my greatest opposition; that is, that communism is good. The argu-

ment that communism is bad is the radical right position. The idea that communism is good is not even believed by Russians. (Laughter) For those of you who are Russian scholars, they have given it up, (laughter) and the classical Marxian doctrine of 1848 went out with the computer, literally. It is not an ideological Soviet Union you find today.

Modern science, technology and medicine have rendered all 19th Century doctrines quite obsolete.

You come over to population, and there it is not quite a ghost yet. The ghost to be is the idea that there is -- the opposite of it is that there is no such thing as a bad person.

I did not communicate with me, so I probably didn't with you. (Laughter)

The idea -- well, let's put it this way: There have been in various thought systems, religious systems and others, the thought that a soul conceived, however misshapen in physical form, as a result, say, of taking German drugs and having been born without arms or eyes, is nevertheless good in God's eyes and must be preserved at all costs. Do you understand me? That is the opposite of the idea that maybe there should be birth control. And in varying degrees and in varying ways -- I am making this as a statement; it is not true, but I am going to say it anyway -- in varying degrees and in various ways everybody now believes there should be birth control. Nobody believes there should be communism. Nobody believes there should be this.

So here are six non-arguments not going on, and that is what I meant when I said this generation of college students is facing a non-time, in the sense our generation did. So they are, if you like, anti-intellectual, if we persist in advancing our arguments as they were when there were arguments there, that there is a new breed of college students obvious to anybody who has stayed put in the same place for twenty years, which I have. If I had been moving about I would assume I had gone to a new kind of place, you know, but since I have stayed put I know it is not the place that changed, it is they. They are certainly different from what they were ten years ago. It would be funny to say that the character of college students is determined by who was president when you were in junior high school. And the last generation I looked at, the President was Dwight Eisenhower, and this generation the President was Jack Kennedy. And Jack Kennedy and Dwight Eisenhower are different. (Laughter)

Well, I do not think that is the point.

We made a study on reading at Boulder, and we found the two top things they were reading last fall were Steinbeck -- I was quite surprised at that -- "The Grapes of Wrath" (the poverty program all over again), and Ian Fleming, spies and gadgets. It seemed to me these are the two things that sort of do characterize our country. You know, U-2 flights and slums, Watts and Powers. (Laughter) There is a real sense in which the riots in Watts are a direct consequence of the television broadcasts of moon shots. If you want to look at the unhappiness of the poor, all of whom have television sets -- incidentally, the middle class has great fun driving through slums saying "Well, they have TV aerals." Well, you can get a TV set for \$24 now. If you cannot pay it it goes away, and you can get another one next month. But you cannot pay your \$2 for it. So television sets in the slum areas is not a sign of opulence. A toilet would cost about two hundred times as much as a TV set in a rural house, in a poverty-stricken Appalachia. So they watch TV, and you look at TV sometime with the thought of what, if you were poor and threadbare and without a job and without any funds, look at the commercials from that point of view, and then look at Cape Kennedy, look at the moon shots. This is what your country can do for you. (Laughter)

That is very, very real, and very important.

The point I am making is my generation was reared on books. I read Louisa May Alcott. I read "Little Men" and "Little Women." The thing about books is they have boundary lines. You read, and you start here, go to the margin, and go on over. It has a beginning and it has an end, and you close it, and then you say "Good night, Mommy," and you go to sleep. (Laughter) And that is the end of that. It is all wrapped up. You look through a television screen, and it is like a window. If this were a window I could show you. If you saw half a house here, there is no boundary line around it at all, and you see half a house, through the window; you do not believe there is half a house outside. You believe there is a whole house. You believe that the house goes on beyond the frame of the window, but you just cannot see quite around the corner. But you believe it is there. You do that with a television screen too. Say you are four years old, or six years old, or ten years old, and you are sitting in the room when Huntley-Brinkley comes on, and they broadcast an irate African leader from Tunisia denouncing American policy in Rhodesia. They have a sense of the world going on and on and on out there, and I had no such sense when I grew up. I grew up with the full intention and goal in life to have a woolen dressing gown and slippers, and a glass of port, and a butler, and to read Conan Doyle. (Laughter) My hero was Sherlock Holmes. They cannot get so excited about that because they see this whole world.

So, my theory here is that there is a way in which college teachers, who are devoted to books, cannot communicate with the new breed of college students who know there is vastly more in the world, and it is so crude and vulgar and obvious, and so easily come by to them.

I was ripping out a wall in a house, I was remodeling, and a child of mine came bounding in with a friend and said, in disgust, "Oh, Daddy, the house looks like it's been bombed." (Laughter) Well, I was pretty unhappy about that, because I felt it was irreverent to treat the idea of bombing so cavalierly. I thought I had badly brought up this child, to not be reverent about bombs. (Laughter) Then I thought "Do I have the ability to assure the child, as it grows up, that it will not be bombed?" And I said no, I don't. So then I wondered if it did not have to develop its ethics in a world I cannot provide an alternative to.

Do you understand what I mean?

You can figure out how many years ago, but there was a four-year-old and a six-year-old looking at Life magazine on the floor. One of them said to the other "No, Alice, those are not the North Koreans; those are the South Koreans." I walked over in bewilderment at the thought of that. The closest thing to a foreign word I knew when I was eight was the word Hun. I was not quite sure what it was; (laughter) it had something to do with somebody's right arm or something. That is all I knew about it. (Laughter)

So I say these kids come to college much older than kids were when they came to college twenty years ago. The whole college scene seems to them to be quite irrelevant and quite childlike, and there is the sort of thought that maybe they have to pamper us in order to get their certificates, because we hold the keys to the door. Then they rebel.

I would summarize this by saying my statement is this generation of college students should be characterized as moral rather than political. My generation was political. I think that is somewhat the same word as Father Greeley used this morning, saying "ideological."

I would emphasize in political the idea of compromise. We had the idea of the small pie which had to be shared. The Poverty Program and the New Deal have nothing in common. The New Deal was a quarrel over how to share a shrinking, small pie. Shrinking and small. And the laws of scarcity of economics were rampant. But the modern technology in energy and communications, celebrated by Galbraith's "Affluent Society" -- and we can demonstrate easily with engineering that we have the

technical know-how and we have the material to provide a first-rate level of living for a population of 60 billion people right now on the surface of the earth without any difficulty at all. So the whole explanation for things that we had about scarcity has been dynamited by the technology of abundance. Yet we are not behaving as though that were so, which gives a ring of hypocrisy or lack of authenticity to our admonitions.

They know this, and they will not, therefore, accept the idea that the best deal you can get by compromise is good enough. So a group of college students at Berkeley who feel it is wrong to jail their students will not settle for freeing all but eight. (Laughter) We would have, I assure you. (Laughter) They will not. They will say "No, sir."

That is what I mean by the statement that they insist upon what I call a moral. It is a little paradoxical, but it is a very annoying thing. Some of them are moral to the point that they insist on displaying their contempt for our historic sexual mores. Our generation would have been satisfied with merely violating them. (Laughter) They insist on announcing that they are violating them. Really. (Laughter) And they regard my advice as immoral. That is what I mean by moral.

"Why," they say, "since I believe what I'm doing is right, should I not stand proudly and say so?"

That is a practical problem, I would say, for you and me. I think these are the reasons, then, coupled with a statement that the historic authority of the college teacher has been undermined by the simple rate of change in the growth of knowledge. When I was in school knowledge changed so slowly that the professor could easily know more than the students, without any question, and the students knew he did. In fact, I would have had a sufficient ambition to have known as much as my professor did. If I thought I could learn as much as he knew I would regard my learning experience as satisfactory. The contemporary student in any field whatsoever in the university would say "If I don't know more than he does, I'm a failure." This is a reversal. It is not due to the fact that our generation of college teachers are stupid, uninformed and so on; it is due to the fact that the rate of change of knowledge is something up with which we cannot keep. (Laughter) And he knows it. And he is inclined in graduate school to have read something we have not. And what was true five years ago, and eight years ago is not true now. It does not matter whether it is mathematics, physics or chemistry, or sociology or economics.

So what I see the university is going to have

to do is to change from an institution that transmits information from one generation to another to a kind of cooperative research team in which the status differences between the student and the faculty are cut terribly much, and they become almost partners in an effort in which the student can probably run faster than the faculty.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN QUIGLEY: Knowing Howard, he delights in having the opportunity to answer questions. If any of you would like to query him on any point --

PROFESSOR HIGMAN: Or, if you would prefer to make speeches, that is all right. (Laughter)

... A question and answer period followed ...

---

SEMINAR

Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"Drugs on the College Campus"

Seminar meeting in the Georgian Room, convened at two o'clock, Richard E. Covert, Assistant Professor of Student Personnel, Queens College, New York City, New York, presiding.

CHAIRMAN COVERT: Good afternoon. Since we have such a very limited amount of time to spend in this seminar, I think we ought to start.

I would like to introduce myself. I am Dick Covert, Assistant to the Dean of Students at Queens College. I am substituting for Dean Kreuzer, who could not be here but who sends his greetings to you.

May I call your attention to the special showing of the Food and Drug Administration's film tomorrow afternoon at four-fifteen p.m. It is listed on page 31 in your program.

We are fortunate to have with us today several well qualified people to discuss the problem. I shall introduce our panelists now before we start with the presentations. I will introduce them all.

Dr. Carl Anderson, on my far right, your left, is a Clinical Psychologist who received his Master's Degree at Ohio State University and his Ph.D. from the State University of Iowa. He has had a distinguished career in work with the Veterans Administration, the United States Public Health Service, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Since October 1958 he has been associated with the National Institute of Mental Health, where he presently holds the position of Chief, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Section of the Community Research and Services Branch.

You were introduced at our banquet last night to another one of our panelists, Dr. Henry B. Bruyn. He serves as Director of the Student Health Center at the University of California at Berkeley, and is Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Medicine at the University of California Medical School at San Francisco. He is also the Immediate Past President of the American College Health Association.

On my left, your right, is Dr. Akira Horita. Dr. Horita did his undergraduate work at the University of Washington and received his Master's and Ph.D. in the Department of Pharmacology at the School of Medicine at that same institution. He presently holds the rank of Professor in that same department.

The order in which our panelists will present their remarks will be first Professor Horita, who will provide us with some background of a technical nature for our discussion. Dr. Bruyn will discuss the experiences and situations on college campuses, and Dr. Anderson will present the concept of drug dependence and some of the NIMH activities.

In our discussion, may I remind you to state your name and institution for our recorder, and indicate to whom you address your question. It will give the other panelists an opportunity to react at that time.

Dr. Horita.

DR. AKIRA HORITA (Professor, Department of Pharmacology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington): Thank you, Dean Covert.

Being the first on the panel here, and apparently the only native of the City of Seattle, I think perhaps it is my place to welcome all of you to the NASPA meetings in Seattle, although I am not a NASPA member. I think there are very few natives of Seattle left in this city, so I present the greetings.

It is a pleasure for me to be here speaking to this group, because we too, at the University of Washington, are concerned with this problem of drugs on campus. Granted, up to this time we really do not have a major problem as far as I can tell. But there are indications that drugs are appearing here and there around the campus and sometimes on the campus itself. So we at the University are quite concerned, and are aware of the possibilities of problems arising sooner or later.

As the pharmacologist of this group, I believe it is my role to describe some of the drugs which are appearing on the campuses, and to discuss some of the reactions they produce in human individuals.

I have on the blackboard here a classification of the various drugs which can be considered as being abused by individuals, whether it be on campuses or not. These are agents which are abused by so-called addicts, at times, and others are just habitues, and some of these appear on college campuses.

The first of these is the drug called the hallucinogen. The term is also used as psychotomimetic agents. In other words, drugs which mimic the production of psychoses, the symptoms of mental illness. Also the term psychodilic agent has frequently been associated with this particular group of drugs. So you will find a number of classifications or terms used to describe this particular series.



We also have the drugs which are known as the stimulant drugs, and by stimulants we mean primarily those which are acting on the brain to produce a stimulant type of effect. And the amphetamines represent one of the better groups.

The other agents which might be considered as important in this particular group would be the depressant drugs, and the barbiturates, as exemplified by drugs, the trade names of which are Seconal, Nembutal, Phenobarb. These are all possibly drugs which can produce problems, and can produce various states of dependency.

Finally, the drugs known as the narcotic agents, and here the best examples, of course, would be the heroin type compounds, morphine and so forth. I am sure Dr. Anderson will clarify more of these in his particular presentation.

Now, of primary concern at the present time, I think, hallucinogenic drugs seem to be in the limelight more than the others, although the others can certainly be considered as drugs which produce problems on campuses. Of the hallucinogens the drug lysergic acid diethylamide, or LSD, has been publicized a great deal in newspapers, television and magazines, and it is now difficult to filter out what is correct and what is incorrect. But we hope, through this panel discussion today, we can shed some light as to the toxicity, the actions, and the possible effects, the effects these drugs might exert on the individual.

I have listed under hallucinogens a number of compounds. The first of these, the agent mescaline, which is the active ingredient in the peyote cactus, if you recall from some of your historical courses, perhaps it was mentioned that the Indians, in the Southwest United States, as well as in South America, utilized drugs during their religious rituals, and the peyote cactus, the buttons of the peyote cactus contain some of the substances which produce some of these hallucinations or alterations of behavior. Mescaline is the active substance.

The second one listed is lysergic acid diethylamide, LSD, and we will discuss this in some detail, so let me pass to the next compounds.

Marihuana is a term used to denote the substance found in a plant, the Indian hemp, which is also known as cannabis. You have perhaps heard of that term, and it is from the cannabis that the marihuana is derived. There are other terms, of course, used by the users, such as pot, or hashish, and a number of other different terms. But there is a substance in the hashish

or the marihuana which produces again various behavioral alterations, and is used by the various individuals we might say have affinities toward this direction.

The terms psilocybin and psilocin I have listed here. We do not see too much of this around, but I must include these two because these are also hallucinogenic substances and it is possible they will appear on campuses. These agents are substances found in the Mexican mushroom -- at least the first isolation was in the Mexican mushroom, and I was rather appalled to hear that we here on the West Coast also have a number of mushrooms called the psilocybin species, which does contain psilocybin and psilocin. These agents also produce the typical hallucinogenic or psychotomimetic reactions.

I believe, on campuses, the substance called DMT has gotten around. This is a substance known as dimethyl tryptamine. I apologize, by the way, for all this terminology. I am sure some of you are familiar with it, but these are used and these are the substances which produce these states of bizarre mental alterations. DMT is the abbreviation used for one of the compounds producing the hallucinogenic response.

Finally, I have down morning glory seeds, because in the morning glory seeds, certain ones, there appears to be substances related to LSD. Actually it is called lysergic acid amide, which resembles LSD in chemical structure. Although it is much weaker than LSD in producing these psychotic states, nevertheless it can produce it in high quantities. The problem with using morning glory seeds, however, is that the user will be taking in not only this one lysergic acid, but there are other substances which may produce violent side reactions, so it is a high price for a kick one derives when using morning glory seeds. But it is, again, a potential source of a drug of this sort.

There are others, again, which produce states of this type, but these are just some of the compounds which may appear here and there.

Now, under the stimulants, I have already mentioned that amphetamine is one of these. Cocaine can also be considered as a stimulant type of agent. I am not referring to mechanisms here at all, but the fact that if given to an individual there is the tendency for a person to become high, or stimulated, as the term would imply.

Of the depressants, the barbiturates, the tranquilizers, these are all substances which will decrease the activity of the central nervous system, and therefore the term depressants.

Finally, the narcotics; again, you know of heroin and morphine and related derivatives. Most of these compounds have the tendency to produce some state of dependency. The terms habituation and addiction have been used in the past. A better term is the word dependency, and Dr. Bruyn and Dr. Anderson will define these further according to the newest concepts.

I would like to turn to the problem of where the students get LSD. This is a major problem, certainly, of concern here.

In the past LSD was synthesized by one of the drug companies as an experimental tool in psychiatry and pharmacology. Since it does produce a state of artificial psychosis, it was thought that this substance could be used to determine whether other drugs might antagonize the psychosis produced by LSD and thus perhaps prevent the production of mental illness, schizophrenic tendencies. This model psychosis is not the same as schizophrenia or mental illness, but there are resemblances here. But from that time on the drug has sort of escaped the experimentalists and has gotten into the hands of the lay public, and under certain circumstances has led to some pretty bizarre and tragic results, so that we now have this problem.

The manufacturers of LSD are no longer making this compound available to anyone, but there is, nevertheless, a source for this stuff. Apparently there is a bathtub LSD being synthesized here and there, and because of this problem we investigated how LSD was made. It is possible that this substance can be produced in someone's garage, or in the kitchen, or in the laboratory of the university campus. This is something we hate to think of but it is a possibility. It turns out that in order to make LSD it is necessary to have the precursor lysergic acid. This is the LS portion of the LSD abbreviation. It is necessary to have this substance known as lysergic acid, which is a substance found in the infected grains of rye. They are known as the ergot. It was the only source for a long time for this particular substance. Now I believe the government has clamped down on the distribution of lysergic acid itself, and so, theoretically, the formation of LSD from lysergic acid should be decreased immensely. However, there is always the possibility of black market stuff, or the material being shipped in illegally from borders, and through borders, so that there may be other sources of lysergic acid.

Once the person has the lysergic acid, it is not too difficult to make the active substance. Granted, it will not be a pure substance when this is formed at the end, but, nevertheless, by having the proper chemicals, diethylamine and a few other substances, and glassware, one can get at least a small quantity of LSD.

The reason LSD is such a problem is that it is one of the most potent agents known to man at the present time. Certainly something that will produce such bizarre reactions of the mind cannot be produced in such small quantities with other drugs. One needs only anywhere from 25 to 50 micrograms, which is an immensely small amount of compound, to produce the reactions, and generally between 50 and 100 micrograms is all that is used by a user of LSD. That means, then, that if a person were to get a gram or two of the precursor he could still make quite a bit of the drug, and impure as it may be it will still produce the desired response by the user. This is one of the problems, the possibility of producing illegally LSD in various places.

Here at the university we have considered the possibility that the laboratories could produce it illegally, so we have our own systems of alertness and awareness in the university itself.

Marihuana is something that is different. This substance is not manufactured; it is derived from the Indian hemp, and this plant grows here and there in almost any part of the country. Although it is placed under the Narcotics Act, the Harrison Narcotic Act, it is, in itself, not a narcotic substance. I believe we will discuss this further later on.

So these are some of the problems associated with the compounds which, as we call them, are hallucinogens or psychotomimetic agents.

We will turn to the question of what LSD or these agents do to the individual. This is difficult to describe, because each person who takes LSD or substances of this sort will respond differently, and it is difficult to say whether that person will have the same response given the drug a second time. We have experienced a number of times ourselves, having gone through these reactions, that one time it would be a euphoric effect, and the next time a dysphoric effect, one that is very undesirable. According to the users, it is either a good trip or a bum trip, and when it is a bum trip it could become quite a horrible experience. How the drug produces these effects is still a question. All we can say is that a number of these psychotomimetic agents seem to trigger some sort of either biochemical or physiological change in the brain, and cause the responses to come about. Now, whether this is an irreversible thing is the big question at the moment, and this is probably one of the reasons why we have to be careful in explaining to those who are users that there is the possibility of further dangers after the drug has been taken; that is, not just the fact that it just produces a response and that it just is over, just like aspirin, but perhaps there is some irreversible action associated

with it. I say this because in the experimental studies it has been possible to show that after administration of LSD especially one can show that the drug disappears from the body and the brain but the response is still present. So it is sort of like a trigger system. It hits something, and the drug produces an effect, the drug is gone but the mental or the behavior alteration persists for a period of time after the drug itself has been removed. And if after chronic usage there is an irreversible response, this, of course, can lead to very difficult problems.

The complications of these hallucinogenic agents are again difficult to explain. There have been a number of people who are really anti-drug who feel that these drugs produce damage to the individual. This may be the case. But to my knowledge there has been no physiological toxicity produced in human beings by especially LSD and related compounds. By physiological I mean there has been no instance of somebody's liver being damaged, or kidney being damaged, or the heart or blood pressure being altered to the point of danger. The primary danger in the use of LSD and these compounds is the fact that there may be a behavioral toxicity. There may be a sufficient alteration of behavior to produce, in one case, possibly, an irreversible type of change. It has been said that those who have schizophrenic tendencies will tend to be pushed over to the schizophrenic side by drugs of this sort. This is not to say that LSD produces schizophrenia, but it is the impetus, or the trigger mechanism to push the individual over to the other side.

The chances of such complications developing are very small, perhaps less than 1 percent, but the point is it is possible that anyone can have these complications arising. And when they do these are series of phenomena, such as the development of delusions, paranoia, panic, and fear. The panic and fear, of course, in themselves are quite bad, but the delusions and paranoia are even worse, because there are indications that some people get these ideas of being able to fly, and jump out windows because they think they can fly. There are those who feel that they are distance swimmers and, not knowing how to swim, they can drown. This sort of thing can happen, which, in turn, of course, can lead to disaster.

So the inability to predict what sort of responses one gets with LSD would be one of the greatest dangers in the indiscriminate use of such agents.

Another possibility that has been expressed is the fact that depression can occur with the use of LSD, and that if the depression is severe enough suicidal tendencies can develop. Again let me emphasize the fact

that the LSD itself is not causing the person to go into a suicidal state; it is the fact that he becomes depressed after the LSD and this in turn could lead to the suicidal tendencies.

Another of the reactions that can occur with these agents is the possibility of a prolonged psychotic response, after the drug has worn off. Normally the effect of LSD is that of perhaps six to eight hours, the peak being at around two hours after ingestion, and it may last as long as ten or twelve hours; the residue, that is. But there have been reports that the drug wears off and a time later, whether it be a day later, a week later, or a month later, all of a sudden the same reaction appears again, and this is in the absence of the drug. This is this prolonged psychotic reaction, or the recurrence of the psychotic reaction that comes about.

So these are some of the dangers associated with the indiscriminate use of agents of this sort. Now, perhaps we can discuss this later, but LSD has found some possible clinical use, and these would be in cases of alcoholism, in the treatment of alcoholism. There are several reports where this compound has served to prepare individuals for impending death, for terminal cases of a carcinoma or other forms of disease. Apparently it is possible to alter one's mood by the use of drugs of this sort. At least this has been reported, so there are possible uses of LSD. It is not all bad, as far as we can see.

Now, finally, let me just mention again some of the types of reactions one sees under the influence of this compound. First of all, there is the possibility of a depersonalization reaction taking place. One appears to be outside of himself looking in at himself. This sort of mental alteration -- I won't call it hallucination because we cannot really call it that -- this sort of behavior alteration is common in users of LSD. There is also the possibility, as I have mentioned earlier, of delusions and paranoia developing. If the dose of the drug is increased, then the reactions become more severe, and, in one instance, in our particular experience, there was an accidental overdose problem and this individual who was considered to be a very normal sort of fellow underwent a typical psychotic syndrome in which he felt he was becoming nothingness, he was losing touch with reality. This was with a large dose. We do not know how much, of course, because this was accidental. But he did go through this stage. He realized he was losing contact with reality, so he began to exercise in his hospital bed, feeling that this would be one way in which he could still maintain this contact. Apparently it is this loss of identification with reality where the fear and panic type of reaction results.

These are just examples of actions associated with this compound. These will differ from person to person. We cannot generalize on these points, because another person will not go through the same symptomatology.

LSD has been one of the most effective agents in altering man's mind, and it is possible that this can be used to advantage in later times, but at the moment there seems to be no real reason for anybody to really use it indiscriminately, just to go on a trip, as they would call it, because it can lead to possible dangers.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN COVERT: Thank you, Professor Horita.

For those of you who came in late, we have, in addition to our panel, whose name is not on the program, Dr. Bruyn, who is the Director of the Student Health Center at the University of California at Berkeley.

Dr. Bruyn.

DR. HENRY B. BRUYN (Director, Student Health Service, University of California, Berkeley, California): It is a pleasure to be able to represent the medical people concerned with the health and welfare of students before a body such as yourselves, equally concerned with student life.

The use of substances that produce changes in our emotions among young people, among young adults, is not new. I think it is interesting to recall that in the 19th Century it was young adults on college campuses who scandalized Boston, New York, and Cambridge, England with their laughing gas parties, with nitrous oxide. The same held true with the discovery of ether, in the same century. The young adult is willing to try these things and is interested in trying them. In the last six years, however, we have certainly had a very different situation, with a widespread concern, which I think is based on fact of usage, a widespread concern throughout our country on campuses of our colleges, as well as in communities around campuses, about the use of dangerous drugs and other substances. I feel that this began, if we want to put a date on it, in 1960. In that year we saw an explosion, so to speak, using an exaggerated term, of usage by students of the stimulant drugs Dr. Horita has mentioned, the principal agent here being dexedrine, or "dex." This was used widely and is still used widely on college campuses and off campus by other young adults, for its stimulant effect.

A relative of dexedrine, which is called methedrine, is used intravenously, or by the "main line."

Methedrine has become widely used since that time and has, to some extent, supplanted heroin in the group of individuals who want to take something by vein.

In the early 1960's, 1960 to '64, around the country, we saw a great deal of use also of the tranquilizers and the sedative drugs that are described by Dr. Horita as depressants. This would include the barbiturates and the other types of tranquilizers such as equanil and librium and others.

Where did the college student get these things? Why did this happen? I want to get at some of the other facets of the why in a moment, but I think one thing that happened was that these drugs were widely available in the community under rather loose controls. The mail order catalogs that were available were utilized by the young adults. There was a great deal of importation from other countries, notably, in our area, Mexico. And these drugs were also exploited in a relatively gray market, in the pharmacies and through other channels. Dexedrine could be purchased by mail, and was purchased by mail in large quantities by irresponsible individuals such as students.

Dexedrine was used also, under prescription, by a doctor, for an anti-obesity program. I think that it took the medical profession and the pharmacology people a little while to realize the potential these drugs represented in the way of producing dependence. We had students who came to college campuses who said they always took these drugs before exams. They came to health services and requested the dexedrine before examinations because they said they had always taken it and there seemed to be a very relaxed atmosphere about it.

We also saw really black market activities with people peddling these drugs on college campuses at the time of examinations, and sometimes with dangerous results. We had one episode at Berkeley that might illustrate this, where a man, unknown except to say he wore a long gray coat, was peddling capsules, three for \$2.50, around the campus at the time of finals. And a student purchased three of these and gave one, very generously, to his current girlfriend. She took it before he took his, and she went into shock. She was brought to an emergency room, where the boy produced the other two capsules. We analyzed them, and they each contained 80 milligrams of dexedrine, the normal dose being 5 milligrams. This was a peddler who had so little knowledge of the pharmacology of it he did not realize how much he could cut his product.

In my opinion, this stimulant type of drug was predominant in the first phases of what has been happen-



ing in the last six years. However, beginning around 1964, there was a great deal of interest awakened in LSD, and we had an explosion of publicity, lots of newspaper and magazine articles began to appear, reaching a climax, I think, in the last six months. This, then, I think, contributed to a greatly increased interest on the part of the young adults on our campuses in these hallucinogenic drugs.

I think it would be interesting if all of us were to try to describe what the problem was on our own campus in regard to these drugs. We have heard a great deal about the great drug problem, but what is our problem, as administrators on college campuses? What are the facets of that problem? I think we have seen several facets, and I am sure all of you could enlarge on this thought.

I think one problem in regard to these drugs (probably a major one) is the fact that as of February 1st most of them are illegal. On February 1st the stimulant and tranquilizer and other depressant drugs were brought under the control of rather strict federal laws which plugged some of the loopholes that were present in 1960. I think, then, one of the problems we have on the campus is that these drugs are illegal.

I think a second problem is that the student who takes such a drug as this and has some sort of reaction represents a problem for the student community. That is, he stirs up a situation which we run into in a variety of ways. We run into it in terms of inappropriate reaction. We run into it in terms of sometimes dangerous reaction in the sense that he acts in a strange way and frightens people. I think this is a second facet of the problem.

I think a third facet of the problem is that of the effect on the individual student.

Now, in the last two years the so-called drug problem on the campus has not been dominated by drugs which produce dependence, because the two drugs I would say are the most popular right now, and were the ones in most common usage, are marihuana and LSD, and some of the other hallucinogens. These are not productive of dependence, which Dr. Anderson will discuss in more detail. But for the individual, then, there is a risk of trouble from the drug itself. Dr. Horita has discussed some of the bad reactions to LSD.

How big a problem is this? From experimental work in a scientific setting, the bad reaction to LSD and related hallucinogens occurs probably in less than one percent. The bad reaction, however, as Dr. Horita

mentioned, can be so bad as to represent a serious problem. I think that is a source of great concern to all of us. While the bad reaction, then, is small in number, it is certainly large in its potential danger to the individual student.

I think it would be wrong, and I think short-sighted, getting at why the student or the young adult turns to these substances, it would be wrong for us to brush it aside as being a delinquent behavior, a kook, a nut, a screwball, an emotionally disturbed student, a fringe-type individual. I think we would be wrong if we said that that was our problem, because I think students and young adults are turning to these substances for other reasons in many instances. I think they are turning to them as an answer to their frustration and their hunger for something they are not getting out of their society today, and out of their educational experience.

This kind of thought is what I have heard many times from the young people. Our society in recent years has become very materialistic, and we have developed a culture that seems to seek a mechanical or a chemical or an expert person as a solution to many of our problems. I think that turning to some of these substances represents a similar groping for a chemical solution to life's problems. I think that this is not unfamiliar. If we broaden this concept and look to other times in our society, there have been other eras and other fads which have demonstrated this same kind of thing.

I think it is interesting that some of the students who have taken LSD I have seen, following the experience, have turned back to religion after their experience with LSD. I think this is very interesting. It may be very significant.

Some of the bad reactions from LSD that have been called bad have resulted in a real change in the individual's life, and maybe these changes have been significant, and may represent a motivation behind some of these individuals trying these drugs. One of my favorite examples of this was an individual who was a Ph.D. candidate in political science. He had been four years after graduation in working on his thesis and as a teaching assistant. He was considered an outstanding candidate for his Ph.D. He had passed the writtens with flying colors, and had six months to go before the orals. He was thought, by members of his department, to be a little more quiet in recent months before this episode, but otherwise nothing spectacular about his behavior was notable. One fine day he walked in to see his professor and told him he was quitting, that he had decided he would not go on in poli-sci. This was so startling and shocking that it led to discussion, and it appeared he had taken LSD on two occasions. He said that following this exper-

ience he had made this decision. He did quit, and put his money into a marina, in the Sacramento Delta. He got a franchise for Standard Oil marine products and put in a few boats. He married the girl he had gone all through high school with, and they now have two children. He is, according to what I hear, and my last brush with him was several months ago, he is the most contented and happy man you could imagine, doing what he feels he was really destined to do. The world of political science has probably lost a great contributor.

This kind of groping, I think, is behind some of the student activity in regard to these substances.

I think, in talking with individual students, and in talking to student groups, as I have been doing for some years now, about this type of substance, I think it is interesting to recognize that the danger of the substance -- and you, I am sure, are all familiar with this -- the danger of the substance is not a deterrent. The young adult is not as concerned with the danger as some of us more experienced, if you will, individuals might be influenced. The danger of the substance is not what deters him.

The use of marihuana deserves some comment, and then I will close.

The marihuana substance, the cannabis drug Dr. Horita mentions, has been known for centuries, probably, and has been used widely throughout the world. It is not productive of dependence -- that is to say it does not require increasing amounts. It does not produce withdrawal symptoms. The effects of marihuana wear off almost immediately, and it is included under the Narcotics Act, and it is illegal. However, marihuana has also, in the last six years, exploded as far as its use among young adults, and despite the laws and the law enforcement I think it is probably in widespread use. I think it is very hard for any of us in college personnel work to assess how widespread is the use with any statistically significant accuracy. I have heard estimates as I have gone around the country, on various college campuses, ranging from 60 percent of the students on large metropolitan campuses to 10 percent and below. I have heard college administrators say that on their campuses there is no marihuana. This may be true. I am inclined to doubt it, because I think this is a very difficult thing to assess. I think all we can say is from what we hear, from our contacts with students, that there has been a marked increase in the use of marihuana, far beyond anything like LSD or even dexedrine. I think it is being widely used. It is available, as Dr. Horita says, because it grows so easily in almost any part of the United States. Even as LSD, it is extremely difficult to detect.

There are many anecdotes about marihuana. One of mine includes a dedication ceremony held on the grounds of a college campus, best unnamed, where the college officials, the president and the chancellor and so on, were gathered to turn up the first spade of earth. They came out with their cars and some cameras to take pictures of this momentous event, and settled down in the corner of this field to pose for the pictures, when suddenly they found themselves surrounded by police. It turns out that there was a large crop of marihuana growing in that field and the police had it under observation. They thought these people were coming to harvest it. (Laughter)

But marihuana is not easily controlled, and I think it is a problem in the sense of our roles on college campuses as to how we handle it. What do we do about this thing? I think the real emphasis should be on the fact that it is, at the present time, an illegal substance, and it is against the law to use it or possess it or sell it or process it.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN COVERT: Thank you, Dr. Bruyn.

Our next speaker will talk about the concept of drug dependence and inform us of some of the activities of his organization.

Dr. Anderson.

DR. CARL L. ANDERSON (Chief, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Section, Community Research and Services Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman; Ladies and Gentlemen: As my contribution to this discussion, I have been asked to comment on the concept of drug dependence and on national developments.

In its thirteenth report, the WHO Expert Committee on Addiction-Producing Drugs (1964) recommended substitution of the term "drug dependence" for the terms "drug addiction" and "drug habituation." Eddy, Halbach, Isbell and SeEVERS, in their recent article on "Drug Dependence: its Significance and Characteristics," state that "Drug dependence is a state of psychic or physical dependence, or both, on a drug, arising in a person following administration of that drug on a periodic or continuous basis. The characteristics of such a state will vary with the agent involved, and these characteristics must always be made clear by designating the particular type of drug dependence in each specific case; for example, drug dependence of morphine type, of barbiturate type, of amphetamine type, etc." The article gives specific attention to the characteristics of the

following types of drug dependence: morphine, barbiturate, alcohol, cocaine, cannabis (marihuana), amphetamine, khat, and hallucinogen (LSD).

The American Medical Association and the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences for many years have been concerned about and have studied narcotic drug addiction. In June 1963 those two groups issued a statement on "The Use of Narcotic Drugs in Medical Practice and the Medical Management of Narcotic Addicts." The statement included a brief paragraph indicating that the "opiate addiction problem can be described in terms of the interplay of three epidemiological factors" -- the agent (the drug), the host (person using the drug), and the environment. The statement has an appendix giving the "WHO Definition of Drug Addiction," which is one receiving comment from the latter WHO Committee cited above.

The problem of drug dependency is one of ever increasing concern to those who have been charged with the responsibility for individual and public health. Similarly, those responsible for the enforcement of existing laws and regulations have likewise been responsive to the apparent need for preventive action. The public, through its elected representatives, the press, and professional and voluntary associations, is sounding an appeal for help in this socio-medical area. Members of your Association have much concern about drug abuse problems and its officials have had discussion with personnel in the Food and Drug Administration and in the National Institute of Mental Health about some activities of mutual interest.

As part of a major reorganization of the National Institute of Mental Health, a National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism and a Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse are being established. Their development will permit more leadership in planning and developing national programs concerned with alcoholism and with drug abuse in collaboration with other federal agencies, national organizations, state and local governments, and voluntary citizens' groups.

#### REFERENCES

1. Eddy, Halbach, Isbell and Seevers: Drug Dependence -- its Significance and Characteristics. Bulletin, World Health Organization. 1965, 32, 721-733.
2. WHO Expert Committee on Addiction-Producing Drugs (Thirteenth Report). WHO Technical Report Series No. 273, 1964, 20 pp., 30¢ per copy. Available from: Columbia University Press, International Documents Service, New York City.

3. Narcotics Addiction. Official Actions of the American Medical Association. 1963, 66 pages. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

CHAIRMAN COVERT: Thank you, Dr. Anderson.

I would like to take the last few minutes for questions from the floor.

DEAN JOHN E. SHAY, JR. (Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia): I believe I will ask this of Dr. Bruyn, but anyone can respond.

I have heard a lot of arguments that marihuana is non-addictive, and, in effect, its effects are much like that of alcohol. You use it, you have a kick, and it is all over, and you said we should use the approach with students who are using marihuana, "Look, it's illegal; therefore you should not use it." So, my question is should we not press for making marihuana legal if its effects are no greater than alcohol?

DR. BRUYN: There certainly is a lot of pressure to legalize -- and I do not like that term -- marihuana. That is to say to remove some of the restrictions on it.

I have the conviction that some of the restrictions are what add to our problem. That is, they add to the enthusiasm with which young adults try things.

I, once, in talking to a group like this, I once tried the interesting thought of how would I, if I were a good public relations man or an evangelist of some sort, for some substance, how would I make it widespread in its use on the college campus and by young adults? What would I do? Well, I think this is an interesting exercise as to how you would get something going. I think the first thing I would do is give a lot of publicity to some fascinating effects it produced. I would try to get this information into all sorts of media; newspapers, television, and so on. I would attack it in some of the big national magazines, and the newspaper media, if possible. I would make it illegal. I think that would add to the momentum. I think, whether I like it or not, I think this certainly does add to the momentum in regard to something like marihuana.

I had the interesting experience at Berkeley, when an article in the Ladies' Home Journal was published on the hallucinogenic effect of nutmeg, which I do not think Dr. Horita mentioned, but it is another agricultural product which, under the proper conditions -- if any of you wish to know, I will tell you in private how

to do it -- but nutmeg has a hallucinogenic effect. The Ladies' Home Journal came out with a fascinating article about the remarkable things this experience produced, and within 24 hours of that magazine reaching the sidewalks -- and I am able to date this and time this because I have a good friend who runs the nearest magazine stand to our campus -- within 24 hours, after that magazine was opened up and started to sell, we had three girls in the health service, (I might add that all of them were sorority girls) from two different experiences -- two and then one -- who were having acute gastritis from eating large amounts of nutmeg. That is not how you do it, incidentally. (Laughter)

But I think the changing of some of the rules and regulations and laws about marihuana are certainly worth discussing. I think it is a very difficult thing for a society such as ours to take this step.

I think any substance can be, in some psychologically disturbed individuals, productive of dependence. I think that, at the risk of being slightly facetious, one could become dependent on angel food. There are people who smoke marihuana all the time. They are chronic users. They are like a chronic alcoholic. They are not any good for society. They are not in school. They are, to some extent, but not quite the extent of the current definition of the word, dependent; they are chronic users. But I think this is a very rare type of situation. I think the effort to legalize marihuana has some reason behind it.

DEAN WILLIAM G. LONG (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina): I have heard other medical people say that marihuana has an escalation factor. That is, that after a while it ceases to be satisfactory and the person is inclined to want to try something else. Do you have any comment to make about that?

DR. BRUYN: That is a statement we have heard for a long time. In my own opinion, it is based on the marketing procedure for marihuana of some years ago. Marihuana was peddled by the same people who peddled heroin. For the most part it was peddled as a loss leader. The real profit was in heroin. I think that culturally, if you will, or sociologically, it became associated and led to heroin addiction, but I do not think for any psychological or any physiological reason. I do not think it was related to the drug itself, from all we know about marihuana.

I would commend to your attention, incidentally, one of the best reviews about marihuana I know of, a review published -- and I cannot tell you at this moment where you can get it. I have it. It is in

university libraries. It is the LaGuardia Commission Report in New York State. It was a commission of the New York State Legislature, and this commission studied and heard testimony about the whole problem of marihuana. This is one of the finest and most objective reviews of this subject I know of. It was as long ago as LaGuardia. What is that, thirty or more years?

I do not think there is much in that report we could disagree with at this present date, and it echoes the view I have just expressed about the linkage of marihuana to other things.

CHAIRMAN COVERT: I think we have time for one more question. There is another session in this room at three-thirty.

DEAN MELVIN A. ANGELL (California State Colleges, Los Angeles, California): As you know, Dr. Bruyn, there is legislation pending before the California State Legislature on the control of these drugs, and I believe you testified before the committee hearing on this particular proposed law. The news commentators in the Los Angeles area took you rather strongly to task. I would like to hear your comments on the proposed legislation, and also your testimony.

DR. BRUYN: I would be very happy to, Dr. Angell.

I have been accused of being a proponent of LSD, or pro-LSD. I do not think we are pro -- I know I am not pro or con. I think we have to talk about this thing without being in favor or against.

The legislation was passed in California despite the efforts of very responsible people. The law put LSD under a structure similar to the Food and Drug Administration's Act in regard to the control, sale and manufacture. That part of the law nobody would disagree with. There was nobody, including myself, who was in favor, so to speak, of widespread use or anything else in regard to LSD. However, the law went one step further, which was where I disagreed, and that was to say it made the use or the possession of LSD a criminal offense.

Now, I have a deep conviction that use and possession laws have not solved problems, and one of my favorite examples is the Volstead Act. Use and possession laws are not the way in which I think a responsible society can get at a problem like this. Use and possession laws, in the case of LSD, are going to be particularly a problem. As I pointed out to the Legislature, I could stand up here and hold up my hand, and in my fist right now I could have 300,000 doses of LSD, worth



perhaps a million dollars on the market, right in my fist here. And I could throw it down on the table and you or anybody else could not prove that it was there or there.

Now that is what use and possession is going to create for us. That is going to be a nightmare of enforcement. Furthermore, with the fact, as Dr. Horita mentions, and as Dr. Anderson has mentioned, there are probably almost a hundred compounds like LSD which are not covered by the law. All you have to do is modify the compound chemically a little bit and you are outside of the law. I think this introduces another problem on use and possession. It does not introduce a problem as far as sale and manufacture, because I think the control at that level is far more adequate.

Lastly, I was very concerned that use and possession laws would make criminals out of a significant number of our college students. I think that the affair in Oregon, where the young lady who published an article in the college newspaper about several people she knew had smoked marihuana found herself arrested and out on bail because she refused to give the names of the criminals she talked to, is the sort of problem, again, that use and possession laws bring up. Use and possession, in the case of LSD, is going to drive the patient away from the doctor. We have had the phone calls already from students who say "I think I have a friend" -- this is like "I have a friend who thinks she is pregnant" -- "I have a friend who is thinking about LSD, and I want to know if you're going to call the cops if anything goes wrong." I want the person who is having a bad reaction to LSD to feel free to seek medical attention. Medical attention is readily available, and there is an antidote for a bad reaction, and the individual must come freely. And again I say use and possession was the part of that law I objected to, not control of sale or manufacture at all. I think the federal law, which was echoed in that part of the California law, is excellent.

CHAIRMAN COVERT: Thank you, gentlemen.

If you have any other questions, perhaps you can see our panelists outside the room.

Thank you. (Applause)

... The Seminar adjourned at three-twenty-five o'clock ...

INFORMATION SESSION  
Monday - June 27, 1966

"The Junior College Student Personnel Services and Staff Inventory -- Conclusions -- Results"

The Discussion Group on "The Junior College Student Personnel Services and Staff Inventory -- Conclusions -- Results," held in the Georgian Room Monday afternoon, convened at three-thirty o'clock, Dr. Frederick T. Giles, Coordinator of College Relations and Professor of Higher Education, University of Washington, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GILES: If we may come to order, I would like to introduce our first resource person for this discussion group on the subject of "The Junior College Student Personnel Services and Staff Inventory-- Conclusions -- Results."

Dr. Max Raines is Professor of Higher Education at Michigan State University, and prior to that time was a student personnel worker, Dean of Students in a community college.

I think what we will do is that Max will start talking with you first concerning the general over-view of the way that the study was conducted and some of the major implications of that, followed by Jane Matson. Then we will have a discussion after her presentation. Max.

DR. MAX RAINES (Professor of Higher Education, Michigan State University): Thank you, Fred. I should make a correction. Jane was recently promoted to full Professor, and I have not made it yet, but I am praying. (Laughter)

For several years during the late fifties I was an unofficial member of NASPA. At that time I was the Director of Student Personnel Services at a community college, as Fred indicated, and I was most cordially received and even served unofficially on Commission III, but I guess my presence caused some consternation among the leadership of the organization at that time. Apparently there was a discussion as to whether junior colleges should be made eligible for institutional membership -- a discussion which I understand may well be resolved tomorrow, and it looks favorable.

It is my personal opinion that the increasing acceptance of junior colleges in the realm of higher education, the need of its student personnel

administrators for professional experiences which NASPA affiliation could bring, the firm commitment of most of the community colleges to strong student personnel programs -- though, as you will hear, they have not all achieved them -- and the very vibrancy of the expanding community colleges will make their acceptance into NASPA mutually advantageous.

My purpose today is to report to you the nature of our recent national study of the Junior College Student Personnel Development. The two year project was funded under a grant from Carnegie Corporation to the American Association of Junior Colleges. This grant was made with the understanding that an independent national committee of prominent educators from various disciplines would be appointed to direct an appraisal of these programs and to seek ways of furthering their development.

T. R. McConnell, Chairman of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley, agreed to direct the work of the National Committee, which included Ralph Berde, Charles Collins, Joseph Fordyce, Edmund Gleazer, Jr., Robert Havighurst, Leland Medsker, Ann Roe, Eugene Shepard, William Turnbull, and Seymour Wolfbein.

As staff director for the National Committee, I soon realized, and very strongly realized I would need additional assistance from professional researchers and student personnel workers. Following this, Don Hoyt of the American College Testing, was invited to serve as our research consultant. Dr. Matson was asked to appraise the various training centers, which were engaged in the preparation of student personnel workers, and to discuss the implications of what she found. James Nelson, whom many of you may have heard in the articulation and implementation of the Noel-Medsker study, agreed to coordinate the work of six developmental centers in widely spread out junior colleges throughout the country.

Finally, J. W. McDaniel, who has authored a book on student personnel practices in junior colleges, agreed to coordinate the work of our project interviewers, and I am happy to announce that one of our interviewers, in addition to Dr. Matson, is with us, Miss Jeanette Moore, who is the Dean of Students at Everett Community College. Jeanette, raise your hand. She is right here. I do not see any others who were on the project interviews.

Our report to Carnegie was completed last fall and copies of the report are now available. I

will show you what they look like. They are in this form. They are heavy, voluminous and expensive, \$5.00 a copy. We would be delighted to have any of you who do not have a copy to order them. They are now available, and you can get them by writing to the American Association of Junior Colleges in Washington.

The concern of the National Committee for Development of Adequate Student Personnel Programs was succinctly stated by Dr. McConnell, in his foreword in the report and I want to quote some of these things, because I think he is a real educational statesman, and I think he gave considerable thought to this before he said it.

"Community colleges have assumed the enormously difficult task of educating highly diverse student bodies. It is obvious that these institutions must provide highly differentiated educational programs. It should be equally clear that if students are to choose wisely among different courses and curriculae leading to a variety of future careers, they must, therefore, be assisted in identifying their abilities and aptitudes in assessing their deficiencies and their potentialities, and in rationalizing their aspirations."

McConnell also observed that the moment of career choice is shifting from high school to the community college level. He continued his observations as follows:

"The community college is rapidly becoming the great distributive agency in American education. Here the student can make a fuller and perhaps more accurate inventory of his characteristics, test his aptitudes and interests in the classroom, the laboratory, or a work-study program. Here he can revise his vocational and educational plans by bringing them more nearly in line with reasonable expectations. Here he can establish his identity, and at least begin to attain the independence that characterizes individuality and adulthood.

"The Committee on Appraisal and Development of Junior College Student Personnel Programs believes that the student body is likely to do these things effectively only if the college recognizes the process of self discovery as one of its principal purposes, and if the institution's personnel services are adequate in scope and quality to give the student the necessary assistance."

Well, in our efforts to seek appraisal and development during the two years, we engaged in a

variety of activities, and I will summarize them very briefly.

First, we wanted to analyze the cultural context. Analyses of the significant elements within the social, economic and educational structure of our society were sought through a series of analytical papers, prepared by noted authorities in these fields. It was their goal to identify those elements that have particular meaning for the development of student personnel programs geared to the needs of the junior college, its students and the society which the college serves.

Several of these papers were presented in preliminary form at a research development conference which was held in Chicago during April, 1964. I have a copy. A few of these are still available, and they are very interesting. I am surprised at the number of these that have gone out, because it summarizes the critical research needs and the discussions that went on in that particular conference.

We brought together representatives from fifty selected junior colleges and twenty-eight consultants -- we had one consultant for every two delegates -- to consider the analytical papers and their implications for defining critical research needs in the student personnel field.

In terms of the research needs, deliberations of participants and consultants were synthesized into this book here by a group of research specialists.

In addition to defining a wide range of needs, the conference underscored the need for a survey and appraisal of existing student personnel programs, and for a study of staffing as well as training resources within graduate centers. In terms of training resources, I will not comment on this because Dr. Matson was the one who directed it, and she will tell you about the scope of her study in that connection.

Developmental centers -- the National Committee also felt that we should explore with a few junior colleges the possibilities of providing really strong student personnel services. Some six centers, widely separated regionally, were selected. In addition to conducting intensive self studies of their programs, each center initiated an exploratory project that might contribute to the development of a particular facet of this program. They submitted these to the U. S. Office of Education and I guess they got lost.

Appraisal procedures, the need for better understanding of the current status of student person-

nel work in junior colleges, and the staffing resources within these programs led to the National survey that I am going to talk about. Selection of a satisfactory sample, and development of adequate instruments and procedures in gathering data certainly presented a considerable challenge. At times I think we were ready to push the panic button.

Of 719 two-year institutions that were operating in 1964, 493, or more easily said, almost 500, had enrollments of less than 1,000 students, while 226 had more than 1,000 students. Yet the larger institutions enrolled three-fourths of slightly more than a million junior college students.

As many of you perhaps know, by early 1970s half of all college freshmen are probably going to be in junior colleges.

In our study, 100 smaller colleges and 50 larger colleges -- and when I say larger, I mean those over 1,000 -- were selected randomly and proportionately from seven regions of the country. By the way, we had to make California a separate region all by itself, otherwise it would have overwhelmed with its numbers the chances for Arizona and a number of other surrounding states to be represented. Seventy-four smaller and forty-nine larger junior colleges actually participated in our study.

Comparison of these samples with their respective populations, indicated that they were not significantly different from the total population in age, type of control, and frequency of accreditation. More than 500 staff members in these 123 participating junior colleges completed an inventory which we developed -- sometimes referred to as the "pink monster" -- the inventory of selected college functions and the inventory of staff resources.

Also, all of the larger colleges and 21 of the smaller institutions were visited by student personnel experts. Because the 21 smaller colleges were not adequately representative of the small college population, we focused our appraisal on the 49 larger colleges which, as you would suspect, were predominantly public and comprehensive junior colleges.

Twelve student personnel experts in junior college education were brought together for an intensive training workshop. During a five day period they developed and field tested an interview guide. Also, they agreed upon a basic frame of reference from which to make their clinical judgments. Each expert was assigned from three to six colleges within his respective

region. Responses to these inventories, along with other institutional materials, were reviewed prior to the visit. An average of seven staff members was interviewed during the day-long visits. They were there, in most cases, about eight hours.

I would just add a statement here that if any of your institutions or some other division would want to make a study, I would recommend that you go one afternoon, stay all night, and then go back the next morning to the institution. There is something about an overnight association that seems to warm things up and make it easier to get information.

Subsequent to the visits, or following these visits, narrative descriptions, much like an accrediting team might do, were written and the ratings were also made, ratings of effectiveness by each interviewer. The descriptions and ratings focused on 35 selected functions and upon 16 institutional characteristics which we believed might be related to program development.

I am going to ask right now, would you mind doing this, if these might be passed out. We have tried to put in a capsule view our concept, as it emerged, of a basic student personnel program for junior colleges. I will pause a minute here while we catch our breath. [Copies were distributed]

While this contains definitions of 35 selected college functions -- by the way, this may be in the script here, but I should point out that an earlier survey done by Joe Fordyce, when they were trying to get a head count of student personnel workers in junior colleges, a number of colleges reported that they did not have a student personnel program. We were kind of set back by this; then when we investigated further we found that they have a dean of admissions, a registrar, a student activities director, and even a counselor or two sometimes, but they just did not refer to this as student personnel work.

So we dared not call this an inventory of student personnel functions. We began to realize that our biggest job was to try to define what the devil student personnel work is in a community college. So we devised a series of statements descriptive of various facets of the work that we do in this field. There were 35 of them, as I say. By majority consensus, 21 (which you have in front of you) were selected for intensive analysis and constitute the basic student personnel program described below.

A comparison of the narrative descriptions -- these are the things that these interviewers wrote up about how well they were doing in this thing, in registration, or how well they were doing in pre-college information -- when that was compared with the quantitative judgment of A, B, C, D (meaning very good, and so on down the line), on scope and quality, we found that we could feel confident about the judgments of our interviewers.

You have in your hands a diagrammatic sketch which summarizes our concept of the basic student personnel program. I hope that its contours do not suggest that we are going in circles. You will note that the outer edges of the diagram contain six basic objectives, with the seventh being in the hub of the wheel. This represents an effort to state in simple, lay terminology what we are trying to accomplish in student personnel work in the community college.

The spokes of the wheel, and the middle part there, represent the 21 basic functions which our panel of interviewers selected following their visits. In addition, you will note that outer rim of the wheel shows the classification of functions into four administrative units, while the inner rim contains four functions that are classified as part of the central administrative unit.

The percentages within each function indicate the extent to which colleges in our sample -- so that you will understand those percentages there -- of 49 colleges had managed to implement the function at what our interviewers judged to be a satisfactory level. Now the judgment of satisfactoriness was made by these twelve interviewers. Their clinical judgments were not made until they had reviewed the self ratings of the participating colleges. You see, each institution went through this process itself first, judging itself, and inventory has a number of questions that it asked them to make judgments about.

As you examine the percentages of the 49 colleges achieving satisfactory implementation, you will note that it ranges from 76 percent for the pre-college information function, to 4 percent for program evaluation. You will also note tendencies for a greater percentage of the colleges to do better in those functions which are essential to effective management of the total institution, rather than in those functions which are concerned primarily with response to individual needs of students, or with evaluating and coordinating the student personnel program itself. And I dare say, though I have no evidence, that this would be the same case in our four-year institutions.



In the process of studying selected variables which might be related to the development of effective programs, we did uncover some interesting correlates of effective development. I should point out to you that our interviewers were requested to make judgments regarding the extent to which sixteen institutional characteristics were having a positive or negative impact on the development of the total program, and this is tough business to make these kinds of judgments.

I will be going through what some of these factors were in just a moment, or what these characteristics were, in just a moment. To obtain some clues as to which of these variables were of greatest significance, we did rank the institutions from the one having the most favorable number of implementations to the one having the least number of favorable implementations, or the most unsatisfactory. We found that our most favorable college had implemented nineteen out of twenty-one of these functions at a satisfactory or very satisfactory level. We found another college that had only five satisfactorily implemented, and fifteen unsatisfactory implementations. This is quite a range, as you can see.

We were able then, through this ranking, to determine which were the top twelve, and the bottom twelve; which, with 49, works out nicely, the top 25 percent and the bottom 25 percent, and then we were able to make comparisons between the strongest programs, at least in our study, and those with the weakest development.

Well, what did we find about the aspects related to development?

You can guess them, almost. Support from administration. It is unlikely that any college can thrive without support of the top leaders. Direct relationships were established between the degree of this support and the effectiveness with which personnel programs were developed.

Another one that is interesting is clarity of staff roles. No other developmental characteristic was so associated with performance in so many of our functions. The data clearly suggests that effectiveness is associated with unambiguous understandings of one's professional responsibilities. In other words, you have to know what it is you are supposed to do, and know it well, to achieve certain degrees of effectiveness. Programs which lacked this clarity and directional quality are not likely to be very effective. The quality itself is probably a direct reflection of leadership in the total college, as well as in the student personnel division.

Indirectly, I should also add that it probably reflects an inadequate number of staff members to whom responsibilities can be realistically delegated. As you know, a small college emerging, people are wearing many hats; they even get confused, and everybody else gets confused, and it shifts so fast that really it almost gets to be chaos at certain stages of growth.

Faculty concurrence with institutional goals and policies. In the community college, as you would guess, it is pretty important that people who are there embrace basically its mission in service to people in the community. In abbreviated form, the findings suggest that the college which knows what it wants to do, and employs a faculty which endorses these goals, produces a climate that seems to be favorable to the development of effective student personnel programs.

Another one was the identification of supportive or empirical data to stimulate development. Were they data conscious in the program, is the essential question. Programs in which efforts have been made to collect relevant facts about students definitely fare better than programs which seem to show little concern for such information.

Facilities and equipment, as you would expect, were also -- I suppose it was easier for our interviewers to determine this one than many of the others. That is not as nebulous as "support of faculty" or "support of administration." You can look around and you can see whether there are good facilities and whether there is good equipment, and so forth. While facilities and equipment as a developmental characteristic seem related to effectiveness in only three of the separate functions, these were certainly highly significant in determining whether it was going to be a strong or a weak program.

Workable ideas and concepts -- in other words, was there evidence in this program that there was some creativity, and that this creativity was being brought out in workable ways so that the staff was invigorated by ideas, and the influx of ideas? This characteristic reflects the presence or absence of creative and practical ideas, and we found that it differentiated.

Inservice training. There were only five colleges that had a satisfactory inservice training program, and all five of them were among the strongest programs, as you would rather suspect. Certainly, training for training's sake is no remedy. Rather, a well developed inservice training program is probably

an outgrowth of a felt need of staff members -- and that probably has something to do with professionalism -- to improve their skills, to keep up with new developments, procedures and knowledge, and to search for evidences of strength and weaknesses in programs.

Another one that I cannot emphasize enough is that institutions having favorable climatic conditions, which then seek and attract professionally trained student personnel workers, develop the most favorable programs.

Our data did not support the conclusion that hiring a large staff of professional student personnel workers will immediately product an effective student personnel program. There are just too many institutional and personal variables that are involved. At the same time, the institution which has a climate supportive of student personnel philosophy, and also seems to have a well defined sense of direction, will find its efforts to attain excellence greatly enhanced by employing professionally trained personnel workers. Evidence regarding professional preparation and development suggested that strong programs were staffed with better trained personnel than the weak programs.

When we looked at the over-all picture of development, it seemed that the restrictive elements seemed to be present. These were some of them. The nature and purpose of student personnel work just have not been interpreted effectively. There is a great deal of confusion in laity, among the legislators, even among faculty, and people who are in association with student personnel as to what it is all about. It led our Chairman, Dr. McConnell, to make a speech at one of the national meetings on student personnel work as the practice of a mystery. Some of you may have heard that particular speech.

Part of the problem seems to be in the need of the perceiver. The anxious administrator may emphasize control of student behavior -- keep the troops from getting restless. The faculty member, bewildered by diversity of ability, may emphasize the screening or culling out of weak students, even in an open door setting. The manpower specialist may emphasize guidance, meaning manipulation of students to fill manpower voids. Each of these persons, therefore, interprets the elephant in terms of his own particular experiences and needs.

In the absence of common understanding of the comprehensive multipurpose of student personnel work, and in view of the pressing need for additional buildings, curriculae, staff, that we have to compete

in this milieu, with these things, it is not surprising that the annual expenditure for student personnel services in the majority of junior colleges is grossly inadequate. The commitment to individuality, custom-tailored, will not be achieved in a bargain basement. Although the present research did not study costs, it seems doubtful that the expenditures for student personnel programs -- and remember, we were studying colleges that do not have housing and dormitories and so on -- it is doubtful that it exceeds five percent of the total instructional budget in most junior colleges at this time. And the size of the staff and equipment and supplies required to meet the diverse needs of this student population would realistically place the minimum expenditure at 10 to 15 percent of the total instructional budget.

Efforts to appraise the programs are seriously handicapped by the absence of well-established criteria. Surprising as it may be, there seems to be little evidence, empirical evidence that a student personnel program has any impact upon student or institutional development. In the absence of criteria and related data, it is necessary to rely almost entirely on conventional wisdom.

This fact was certainly apparent during our research conference. We have a tremendous task ahead of us. I am going to stop now so that Dr. Matson can tell you about some of the training resources and what chances we have for strengthening our programs through these programs. Then we may, if time permits, and questions permit, give you some of the recommendations that we have made nationally, which we hope to see implemented. Thank you. (Applause)

DR. JANE MATSON (Professor of Education, California State College at Los Angeles): I am going to describe to you briefly the study that we did of the training resources and some of the comments which I made after making this study.

The contribution which adequate student personnel services can make to the achievement of the over-all objective of the junior college is obvious to this audience certainly. I do not need to elaborate on that. But the idea that special preparation to perform these services is desirable has not developed as rapidly or as extensively as actually the acceptance of the services themselves, as an integral part of the college program.

The teacher who "likes students" or who was willing to accept the assignment, usually perhaps on top of a full time teaching load, volunteered or was

asked to participate in the student personnel functions and carry them out. Special programs of preparation have been available in this field since the 1920s, but in actuality only a very small percentage of the persons who are actually engaged in providing student personnel services at all levels of education have been enrolled in these programs. Even today the necessity of professional preparation for student personnel work is not accepted by many in higher education.

However, anyone who is participating in professional organizations these days knows that a great deal of time is being spent in discussing the nature and dimensions of the experience and educational backgrounds that are desirable to produce competent student personnel workers, and this Conference has been no exception. I have spent a good many hours already at this.

The complexity of the problems with which we are now wrestling in this area of preparation is inherent in the many faceted functions which might be collectively described as student personnel services, and Dr. Raines has described to you the problems that we faced in the study of defining what we are talking about when we use the term "student personnel."

I wanted to take a look at the training resources in the country. I tried to define this in as broad terms as possible, in order to avoid emphasis on only one or two functions, such as counseling. The names of colleges and universities which were considered to be possible sources of information regarding either formal or informal programs of preparation were selected from appropriate sources, and if anyone is interested, I will tell you where I got these names. A list of 106 institutions was prepared, all of which purported to offer graduate level preparation in the areas of college student personnel services, or in counseling psychology.

The amount of work offered in any one of them ranged from a course or two, to an organized curriculum leading to a specialist's or a doctor's degree. The administrative placement of the courses or programs varied among the departments of guidance or student services, department of higher education, departments of school or college administration, department of education, and department of psychology.

I sent a letter to each college or university, addressed to the person who was supposed to be in charge of the program. I did this in terms of an informal letter, rather than a questionnaire, because I know my reaction when questionnaires come across my

desk which are somewhat long and involved, and I thought that perhaps a personal letter would be somewhat more productive of the kind of information I was seeking.

I asked them to respond to five questions:

1. If a prospective student were to indicate his intention to prepare for student personnel work in a junior college, what program of preparation would you recommend?

2. What area of study would you consider most important for the student personnel workers in the junior college as compared with high school or four-year senior college?

3. Are there any areas of study or courses which should be added to your present institution's curriculum in order to prepare the junior college worker?

4. Please describe briefly what you consider to be the essential practicum or field work experiences for this student.

5. To what extent do you believe that all student personnel workers need training and counseling?

I received replies from a little more than sixty institutions.

Then I went out and visited a number of these schools that either indicated they had a program at the present time -- some special program for junior college workers -- or who were interested in starting such a program. I think when I finished I had enough information, enough data to give us, at least in general terms, an idea of the existing situations and the major problems faced. I would like to tell you a little bit about the kinds of response that I got.

I made no statistical analysis since this was a personal kind of thing, and I really did not have that kind of data. But I think I can make the following observations.

First of all, with reference to question 1, which you will recall had to do with, what would you tell a student who came and said he wanted to be prepared for junior college student personnel work? About one-third of the respondents described counselor education programs designed for public school counselors, without reference to any needed or desirable

adaptation of the program for the junior college student personnel worker. In other words, they did not see anything different about this at all.

Approximately one-fifth described counselor education programs designed for public school counselors, but indicated that they would make addition or substitution of courses directed specifically to work in higher education, not specifically junior colleges, just higher education.

Slightly fewer than one-fifth described programs especially designed for student personnel workers in higher education, without any reference to the junior colleges as a specific segment of higher education.

Five institutions described programs that were designed to prepare student personnel administrators in institutions of higher education, again with no reference to the junior college as a separate or a specific area.

Six institutions described either counselor education or student personnel work preparation with specific adaptations to the special needs of those interested in working in the junior college.

One institution described simply a traditional counseling psychology doctoral course.

Question 2: What areas do you consider of the greatest importance?

About two thirds of the people responded to this particular question and of these almost one-half expressed the opinion that there was little or no difference in the emphasis recommended for junior college student personnel workers from the emphasis for those for whom their program was originally intended, whether it be secondary guidance workers or those in higher education student personnel work. Where differences were suggested, the need for knowledge of the philosophy and function of the junior college, and more preparation in vocational counseling and occupational information were the most frequently mentioned.

Question 3, which had to do with what areas of studies would you add to your present program? Slightly more than 70 percent commented on the need to add courses, if they were to undertake the preparation of junior college student personnel specialists, and of these, almost half of them said they would not need to add any courses at all, that their curriculum was quite adequate as it presently was constituted to prepare junior college student personnel workers.

Question 4, which had to do with practicum or field work experience. Only one-third stated that it was essential that the practicum or field worker internship be in a junior college setting. The remaining two-thirds either made no statement at all or were of the opinion that a practicum in a four year college setting would be quite satisfactory. The necessity of having practicum or field work experience in a junior college is not generally recognized.

Question 5, should all student personnel workers be trained in counseling? The highest percentage of agreement in the responses to any of the questions was found here. About 90 percent of those who commented on this question, which was about 70 percent of the total respondents, stated unequivocally that knowledge of counseling was essential in the preparation of all student personnel workers. There was some variation about the proportion of the program which should be devoted to counseling courses, but there was no doubt on the importance attributed to at least a minimal knowledge of counseling.

From the visits to the universities and colleges that I made, in general these visits supported the evidence from the written replies.

I did look into the matter of facilities and I was pleased to discover that in general these facilities are adequate and at least there is an awareness of the needs in this area, and there are efforts being made to meet them.

As far as the curriculum is concerned, it was obvious, as you might gather from the responses to the letters, that no attention has been given to special curriculum problems which arise out of the task of preparing junior college student personnel workers. I think it is fair to say that in general the student personnel educators of the country see no problems in this area, that no particular adaptations of curriculum are perceived as being needed.

As far as staff is concerned, whatever problems may exist in the preparation of junior college student personnel specialists, an important key to their resolution lies in obtaining adequate staff to do the job. Among the present faculties in the area of counselor education and of preparation of higher education student personnel specialists, there is a serious shortage of persons who have had experience in student personnel work in junior colleges, or even who have had a well founded understanding and acceptance of the role of the junior college in the American educational system.



I might add parenthetically that I think the same thing is true in terms of student personnel preparation programs for the four year college. Last night one of our participants said that in his institution there was only one person teaching in the field of higher education who had ever had any experience in student personnel work. That is only one person teaching in that area had ever had a day of work experience in the field of student personnel in higher education. I think this is generally true.

I think this presents a real hindrance to the realistic development of programs of preparation for junior or senior college student personnel specialists, and what we are going to do about it, I do not know, but maybe you will have some ideas.

Coordination with other departments was another area I investigated, and it is difficult to make any valid generalizations here because the situation existing in each college or university to a great extent is a function of personal relationships, historical development, college policy and organization. We pay a great deal of lip service these days to the cross disciplinary approach. We believe in it, I think, theoretically, but how it is implemented will vary greatly from one institution to another. It depends to some extent on this whole business of how well people know each other, how well they work together, and so on.

The practicum setting -- it is a generally established principle in student personnel preparation that students should have an opportunity to practice in a setting which contains the essential elements of the setting in which they intend to work. On the campuses that I visited the majority of the students were ostensibly preparing to work in a high school setting and their practicum experience was planned to either take place in a high school or with high school students. This is a principle which has been well established and well implemented in secondary counseling and guidance preparation programs.

If the graduate students in a counselor preparation program had made a definite decision to seek employment in the junior college, and a junior college was conveniently available, the practicum was frequently scheduled at the junior college. However, there is a tendency on the part of practicum supervisors to equate the junior college student body with the freshmen-sophomore students at a four year college, and this results in some cases in the junior college bound counselor being sent to the college or university counseling center for his practicum experience.

It was apparently believed that as long as the age of these students is similar to those in the junior college, the practicum experience in the four year college would be adequate. The differences between junior college and four year college student population and their significance for the counselor as well as the differences in the roles of the junior college counselor and the counselor in the typical college or university counseling center have been apparently overlooked or considered sufficiently unimportant to warrant the establishment of practicum or field work experience in a junior college.

In the organized programs of preparation for student personnel work in higher education, the role of the practicum has been less clearly defined. The prime emphasis in the past has been in the area of housing, with some graduate program including more comprehensive experiences in a variety of student personnel functions. This field work or practicum usually occurs on the campus where the graduate study is undertaken.

Instances where students preparing for junior college personnel work, other than counseling, have had practicum or field work experience in a junior college are extremely rare. In fact, I do not know that I ran across any, outside of my own institution, where students had had practicum experience in something other than counseling actually in a junior college.

I think it is apparent that little is being done in the area of specific preparation for junior college student personnel specialists, yet it is equally obvious that junior colleges are filling their student personnel positions each year, and have been doing so for many years in the past. The question is, where are they coming from? Not all of those selected to fill these positions have had any professional preparation. A good percentage have had some kind of program of courses in the areas of either guidance, counseling or student personnel work. Whatever preparation has been obtained has been predominantly directed toward either secondary guidance, four year college student personnel work, or counseling psychology. This is about the only choice that a person has had, and this study, you remember, was done before the advent of the NDA institutes. But up until that time about the only choice a student had was to either get into a program that dealt with secondary guidance, four year college student personnel work, or counseling psychology.

I do not intend to try here to evaluate the quality of these training programs, or to question the capacity of these individuals to learn their jobs after they obtain them. I am sure that many of them have

attained a high level of proficiency. The question that I am concerned with, though, is it seems to me appropriate to wonder whether they have been provided with the kind of preparation which has been most beneficial to them in their capacities as junior college student personnel specialists. In other words, have they been given their money's worth by the institutions in which they have pursued their undergraduate training?

There are a number of issues which arise out of this, which I might just mention very briefly, because I am sure that they would come to your mind.

First of all, the question that is most frequently asked by both counselors and student personnel workers is, do junior college student personnel workers really need programs of preparation which are specifically designed for them, or will a more generalized program suffice?

A quick answer to this, to me, is one that does not satisfy me, but at least gives you some idea of the scope of the answer. To the extent that the junior college has unique qualities growing out of its special goals and objectives, the most effective programs of preparation for student personnel workers will take cognizance of those unique aspects and their implications. I think this applies equally to teaching and to administration.

It should not be inferred from this that there is no commonality or overlap between these functions as they are performed at various educational levels and settings, but to omit almost entirely from the content of preparation programs any reference to the junior college and its characteristics and problems does not provide the best possible preparation of well qualified professional persons to serve in the junior college.

In my opinion, it has something to do with explaining the situation that we found in the larger study of the status of student personnel work in the junior college.

Another issue is, should programs of preparation be designed for the generalist or the specialist in student personnel work?

This is one, I believe, that we will be discussing for a long time to come. What student personnel function should a training program include? Another approach to this question might be in terms of whether the program should be designed to prepare the

generalist in student personnel services or specialist in a number of specific areas? We have no clearcut definitive answers to this question as yet. There seems to be some agreement that counseling is a separate student personnel function, requires specialized skills and knowledge which can be acquired most efficiently through a specific program of preparation. There is a general, although by no means universal, opinion among counselor-educators and student personnel-educators that counseling is the basic foundation of any program of preparation for student personnel work. As one respondent to this letter of inquiry said, "I do not think of a person as being a student personnel worker unless he has had training in counseling." This represents one end of the continuum, and the other is that he does not need any training in counseling, because he is not doing anything that has to do with counseling.

The emphasis in the existing organized programs of preparation for student personnel work in higher education has been on preparing a generalist with further emphasis on broad administrative functions, rather than on the role of student personnel services in relation to the student's educational and social development. Tom Emmet stated, in his "Guide to Programs of Training for College and University Student Service and Personnel Worker," "The usual plan is to get a doctorate in higher education, which includes a student personnel course or two, and to take a cognate program in a teaching discipline or behavioral science to aid in the student personnel service career choice."

I am afraid that that, what I consider a rather sad state of affairs, is somewhat descriptive of the general state of student personnel education in this country. The kind of specialized preparation which is appropriate for those who carry responsibility for leadership in the administration of student personnel services has never really been considered in detail. There is little doubt that one of the most pressing needs in junior colleges at the present time, and in all other levels of education, I might add, is forceful professional leadership. Exploration of various means of obtaining this leadership still remains to be done, it seems to me.

It seems likely, though, that the most fruitful source of student personnel administrators should be from the ranks of those professionally trained individuals presently providing student personnel services, but that is not always the way things happen.

The third issue is, what is the proper length of an organized program of preparation?

I do not want to belabor this point, because it seems somewhat technical. There is less than unanimous agreement among administrators, student personnel workers, and those responsible for their professional preparation. I would like to make the point that as far as junior colleges are concerned, I would like to see the programs of preparation be of equal length and hopefully of equal quality to those required for secondary school guidance people. I do not think the job of student personnel work in the junior college, or the four year college either for that matter, is any less demanding than that for the secondary school. Therefore, we should have at least equal training, which is increasingly characteristic -- the two year program is becoming equally characteristic.

However, supply and demand functions cannot be entirely ignored, and the demand for personnel to assume responsibility for student personnel functions is increasing at a startling rate of speed.

At the moment, it seems to me, a widespread game of musical chairs is going on with the trained, experienced student personnel worker, the objects of keen competition, and the vacant chairs largely filled by classroom teachers with little or no professional preparation for the positions they assume.

This is a problem which we are going to have to face up to, I suspect, and find out what we are going to do, what represents the minimal level of pre-service professional preparation, and what standards of minimum preparation should be -- or how they should differ between specific student personnel functions.

The conclusions that I drew from this study:

First of all, clarification and delineation of the functions included in the term "student personnel program" are needed. Dr. Raines said something of the same thing.

We know that junior colleges are generally providing student personnel services with less than adequately trained staffs. Forty-five percent of the student personnel workers responding to this questionnaire in the larger colleges, and 60 percent in the smaller colleges, could be classified as inadequately prepared through professional training to perform student personnel functions.

We note thirdly that the existing resources for the professional preparation of student personnel workers are not equipped to give special attention to unique needs of the junior college.

Four: We know that professionally prepared student personnel specialists are in demand for all levels of education and that there have been up to now only limited opportunities available to the junior college student personnel worker who was interested in upgrading himself through some form of inservice personnel training.

I will stop here now, and maybe we can have discussion, or Dr. Raines can talk to you about the recommendations that were made. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN GILES: We have had a report from two people who were intimately involved in probably one of the most extensive studies on student personnel that has been conducted, and these people are talking directly from the study and the experience that they have had, rather than from what they have read.

Perhaps you would like to have some question or you would like to have an elaboration on some phase of what they have suggested to you, or perhaps something which they have not touched on, which you would be most interested in having them spend a minute or two on.

... A question and answer period ensued from the floor ...

---

DISCUSSION GROUP SEMINAR  
Monday Afternoon, June 27, 1966

"The Environmental Dimensions of Campus  
Planning and the Role of the Student  
Personnel Administrator"

The Discussion Group Seminar on "The Environmental Dimensions of Campus Planning and the Role of the Student Personnel Administrator," held in the Williamsburg Room, convened at three-thirty o'clock, Dean Roland Patzer, University of Vermont, presiding.

CHAIRMAN PATZER: I think the theme of this Conference has been pretty well set by Glen Nygreen's opening address and the reactor panel. I was very interested to note that in the discussion that ensued by the reactor panel to President Nygreen's address there was no disagreement on the role of the student personnel administrator as a climate creator, and that this role is the primary task of the student personnel administrator.

In my observation in the field, and in this Conference, it has only been recently that the student personnel administrator has been concerned with the climate with regard to the physical planning. This is why I think it is particularly significant for such a program to be part of our annual Conference.

I suspect that perhaps one of the reasons that this has not been of great concern to our profession is that perhaps we reflect a leadership role not unlike that story attributed to President Roosevelt in the early years of the New Deal. As you may recall, there was a continuing conflict between Harold Ickes and Harry Hopkins. As the story goes, one day President Roosevelt was seated at his desk, and Harold Ickes came in and said, "I have a proposal. I want you to take care of this proposal. It is in dire conflict with Harry Hopkins, but I am right and this is the way we should move."

"President Roosevelt said, "You are right. You are right, Harold. You're absolutely right."

Later on in the morning, Harry Hopkins came in and said, "I have a proposal. I know that you are going to get disagreement from Harold Ickes on this but I am sure I am right in which way we should go, in the direction we should move."

President Roosevelt said, "You are right. You are right, Harry. You're absolutely right."

All this time, behind him Eleanor Roosevelt was sitting, and she said, "Franklin, I don't quite understand you. You said to Harold Ickes, "You're right. You're right. You're absolutely right" when he presented an argument for a proposal which was diametrically opposed to Harry Hopkins, and you said to Harry Hopkins, "You're right. You're right. You're absolutely right."

And Roosevelt's response was said to have been: "Eleanor, you're right. You're right. You're absolutely right." (Laughter)

This, I think, is an illustration of where I think we have failed in our responsibility to become more knowledgeable, more understanding, more sensitive and more creative in this field of the environment and the campus planning.

We have set the program about in two phases. First, we will talk about campus planning as a general phase, and then we will discuss the specific of residence hall planning in the second phase.

The first gentleman who it is my pleasure to introduce is a man who has distinguished himself internationally in the field of architecture. He just recently returned from Africa, where he is planning a university in Lagos, in Nigeria. Mr. Kiley is a man who has been a recipient of many honors and awards. He has, during his lifetime, in his private practice participated in over 500 projects in at least 30 states and a number of foreign countries. As I look down the roster of the number of schools that he has been involved in as a landscape architect, it very much reflects the number of institutions that are represented in this room: Chicago Art Institute, Concordia College, Dulles International Airport, Fredonia College, Lincoln Center, Neiman-Marcus, Syracuse University, United States Air Force Academy, University Circle, Case Tech, Western Reserve, University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin.

He also is a member of President Kennedy's Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D. C. And last but not least, he is also the campus planner for a school very close to my heart, the University of Vermont. We are very privileged to have Mr. Kiley with us. I would say that perhaps the best testimony that I can give to him is the fact that he is a very creative human individual. Mr. Kiley. (Applause)

MR. DANIEL KILEY (Architect, Wings Point, Vermont): Thank you. I like big build-ups. It sort of takes the pressure off the idea of the talk, so



that the longer they are the better.

I think we have decided to practice what we preach in this environmental switch. I think the speaker last night, President Leggett, mentioned that you should get the right people together. That is one step, and the other one was the developing of a sense of community. Rather than a speaker speaking at people, the idea of the seminar discussion is that we are really finding out together. I think that also pinpoints our relationship when we work with clients, whether they be the president of a university or the student personnel administrator, or whomever; the idea of the designer not coming in and imposing a beautiful picture or a picture of sorts on a situation. Rather, the sensitive designer seeks to find out from all sources as much as he can, what the nature of the problem is, and how to approach it and how to solve it.

I think the very first point is getting together right on a good basis. I think that is terribly important.

I am not a natural person who can write a speech. My intellect is terribly low, but I have high enthusiasm, and when the talk is far enough ahead I sort of accept, feeling very important that I am going to speak to so many important people. Then as the time gets closer and closer, I find I end up instead of flying, I take the slowest way of coming out. So I flew to St. Louis on certain projects, and then I took the overnight train. Even that whole day on the train going through beautiful environment still did not solve my problem of what to say. So I always have to sneak up on it or throw it to chance, like nature, and try to get connected, we might say, in a natural way.

I think this is the same thing in design too, seeking this natural connection rather than an academic or intellectual approach.

Anyway, after doing this for many thousands of miles, I finally at least got a title, and I usually never get a title because I always say the same thing and you cannot name it normally; but I felt that since I was in the West and the Western civilization, that it is good to have a title to a talk. So my title turned out to be, "The Cultured Environment; or the Environment of Culture, the Campus." That suggests a beautiful idea, and it would be wonderful if this were the case. It would be truly reflective of a great educational system if our campuses were cultured places.

Culture cannot be segmented into fields where you are knowledgeable in this, and possibly sensitive,

and then reach a block as soon as you get to the border of your field. I think this is our whole problem. It is that we have been working in compartments, and the aim of the designer-planner, in a physical aspect, is to break from those compartments and try to see whole and see continuous. We are trying to see growth. We do not like to think in terms of static situations. Especially with the rapid growth of the campus and the educational demands, it seems even more that this is important because if you do think in static terms in no time you are trapped. You cannot expand. You lose the original functional relationships that started. So the thing worked beautifully and you find yourself trapped, running out of land for that wonderful gift from the government or some donor that you could start another college with.

I think the main approach to the way we look at it is that we are seeking that kind of a campus plan or pattern that is more or less nuclear, or one possible of growth and development. Therefore, we see it as a pattern not unlike science finding as you get closer to the scene you find that things get less organic and get more developmental.

So, as a suggestion, the ideal campus, from my point of view, would be that kind of a pattern that would be related functionally, part to part, tied together by proper circulation. But then the parts could grow, just like a body and an organism in its environment; and the interstitial space would both be a pulsating sponge that could take the growth but never lose its original relationship. That is the ideal thing.

In the past, before the great pressure of education need, our campuses tended to be designed in a static way. Most of the old campuses, as you know, have this sort of well designed core. The University of Vermont has a beautiful green -- the Vermont green, with lovely buildings around it. Through shortsightedness, they let one-half of the green slip away from them to another use; so now, just the administration building is on that side. Then, when the first growth emphasis started, instead of looking wholly and looking at the relationship of the core to the future, buildings were plopped down haphazardly around the periphery. This is true in Minnesota, where we are consultants, and it is also true in almost all of the city universities and colleges, like Harvard and Yale. The whole yard at Harvard is beautiful, wonderful scale, but then things get dissipated all throughout the community. That is not necessarily wrong, but they should connect with the community in all dimensions.

I think the idea of flexibility is very

important, and that would be my, you might say, projection as a blueprint of how a campus should grow. Man has been constantly seeking some kind of unity or connection, and on the campus as well as in general. The campus and life in general are not two different things, of course, but the campus could be a, you might say, ideal example of what the community could be. All of the splits we are having and the problems that are arising are not only arising on the campus, but they are arising everywhere, as we see, all over the world.

There have been various types of remedies or some way to meet this, through religion -- the idea of Zen, I suppose, is to make a leap from the intellect body idea into one whole idea. LSD is a sort of a quick study or pilot idea of what life might basically be. Design and the efforts of design also are trying to show in the physical environment what integration is, by way of physical integration, that it can show the way to total integration of man and his environment.

The student personnel administrator -- I do not know what his role is in it, but I imagine, as in any area or field, the student personnel administrator has a great opportunity if he is the type of person who can accept the challenge, and it would seem to me he is ideally suited to taking up this challenge since he is close to the student and following the student throughout his life on campus. Therefore, he is working with the real life that is there.

Just as an architect or anyone should be, a student personnel administrator must be open minded and aware, informed and imaginative. If he is closed down and knows all the answers, you might as well give up before you start. I think that applies to everything in life.

I can think of two sort of fairly famous scientists -- quite famous -- who are also presidents of colleges. One of them is the closed mind type who knows. The other one is the opposite. The opposite one automatically has achieved greater scientific success and has become more of a large world figure than the other one. I think that the closed mindedness will stop any growth, so I think that being humble and open you can get into all kinds of possibilities and start to make a crack at solving the problem.

Besides all that sort of general idea, I would like to just suggest, besides, that there is something in the design of space today that is completely different than at any other time. So a really sensitive, contemporary designer is trying to be up at

the point of departure of all events, and he is seeking to make space he designs and relationships while he is solving the problems that were unknown in the past, just because he is living today. Therefore, through the flexible, continuous environment, the most exciting design spacial qualities are obtained. It is a whole new area of possibility that probably can best be seen through LSD. (Laughter) I cannot describe it. There is no point in even mentioning that you don't start designing by getting ideas and transplanting ideas from one solution to another. Each problem, each site, each condition has the elements of its own design latent within it.

We have to just try to pick it open and see what is there really. This is what makes design fun; and I think life itself should be fun. I always say that if it is not fun I am not interested in it. But regardless of the job, even with eight children, I still try to hold to that. It should be play in the universe.

Then I have some other things about the actual details and elements, but I have skipped that, and I will just sort of wind up with this general thought of what the campus might be. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PATZER: Thank you, Dan. I think later we will want to talk to you about parking, and a few of the other influences that have a bearing on this overall design.

Next I would like to present a man who I also have been privileged to come to know in the last year, a man who a little less than a year ago assumed the position of Dean of the School of Architecture at Princeton University. Prior to that time, Mr. Geddes was with the University of Pennsylvania in the School of Fine Arts, and his experience, his educational experience at the Harvard School of Design, has put him in good stead as a professional architect. He is also a member of a firm, the firm of Geddes, Bircher, Qualls & Cunningham.

He too has distinguished himself in a number of awards. He has planned, specifically, residence halls at the University of Delaware, a dining hall and residence complex at the University of Pennsylvania, the town design for Rockville, Maryland, a campus plan for Beaver College, and the town plan and village center for Reston, Virginia, among a number of his efforts thus far.

I think more personally I should like to say that if any of you have had the experience of

chairing a committee to select an architect, I think a great deal depends on the ability of the architect to translate into a meaningful philosophy the concept of his residence planning. Having sat through a committee, listening to approximately 20 architects, I knew immediately after Mr. Geddes' presentation that this is a man who not only could design an create, but could articulate his creative ability. I should like to read just one brief sentence from him which I think sums up his philosophy. This he said upon taking the position at Princeton:

"Probably each generation has to rediscover for itself contemporary roots of architecture, the kind of functionalism that is its own reality. I hope to improve the connections between architecture and science and technology on the one hand, and the humanities and the social sciences on the other, to make a continuity of architecture and urban design and to make of architecture a more humane social art."

I think this is a sufficient introduction,  
Bob. Mr. Geddes. (Applause)

DEAN ROBERT L. GEDDES (Dean, School of Architecture, Princeton University): After that introduction, it makes me feel like I ought to go out and get to work at Princeton. (Laughter)

The subject that we are discussing -- I asked if I could use a case study, a kind of a detailed look at it, so that by concentrating on residence halls I could make a few specific points about programming, environmental design, and environmental programming in general. Mind you, it is always difficult to talk about a field as general as the environment by looking at it through the small end of the telescope, which is what I will be doing. But in a way, it sets the basis for understanding what architects and campus planners feel they need in terms of an ideal relationship to student personnel administrations, to the users, the deans of students, and ultimately the students themselves.

Let me just go back a little bit in the history about residence halls, and if I can, I will end up with five specific requests which, in a way, I bring to you from the architects themselves. This is how we would like to have it if the world were better than perhaps it is.

There are very few environmental jokes. I have one that has to do with our problem today in an extreme situation as compared to the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries, when things were progressing very slowly.

I think it is largely the result of two things. This is not the joke part. This is the serious part. One is that the population increase makes many of the things that were occurring slowly occur now very quickly. It is as if you took a moving picture film and instead of running it at the normal speed you began to increase it. New patterns, in fact, might begin to emerge. That, of course, is clear.

The other thing is that ours is an increasingly affluent society that is pluralistic, that is in fact a society where there is not necessarily one kind of education or one kind of campus or one way, in fact, that the student will live or that education will occur, but there are probably several viable ones, and that choice, diversity, the freedom of choice is in fact desirable.

Perhaps most important of all is we are really taking the point of view that everybody counts, not just a few; and that education, campus climate would reflect this, and certainly dormitories would reflect it. It is not an aristocratic, authoritarian situation, but one which is freely an open kind of society.

The impact on campus planning is very great. We no longer build aristocratic kinds of buildings. We no longer build buildings which attempt to look like mansions of the aristocracy or palaces, but we are really beginning to realize that the kind of life that an open, pluralistic society has can be reflected and expressed, and even helped along by its architecture.

There are certain problems in this. One is the enormous speed in which all this has to occur, the enormous engulfing. We are building at such a rapid rate. That is the story. In Philadelphia, the word was passed down that within 24 hours the world was going to be covered by water and we were going to be engulfed in another flood. Three great religious leaders got together and each made a pronouncement. One said that we had 24 hours to come to a final understanding. I am not very good on comparative religions. I don't know which one said that. One said that we had 24 hours to come to a final understanding of the meaning of life. Another one said that we had 24 hours to come to a consensus amongst all of us. And the third one got up and said, "We have 24 hours to learn how to live underwater." (Laughter)

As far as architects and campus planners are concerned, with literally the gulf of students that are coming, the increase in our responsibilities to society, we just are in that third predicament. So what do we do

about it? Perhaps we can look back a little bit historically as to what the relationship between living accommodations, residence halls, and campus planning has been.

The tradition goes back about 700 years in Western Europe. There have been two clearly separate viewpoints. The first universities, especially those in England, developed -- well, let me say that there were two basic kinds of universities that were developing. The English universities developed on the tradition of hostels -- that is, of residential living. The hostels themselves grew into colleges, which became both academic and residential units for both teachers and students. The first of these is the University College at Oxford, which actually was a half residence in 1250 A.D.

On the other hand, quite a different tradition existed on the continent where French and German continental universities were non-residential from the very beginning. They gave no grades, and they owned no buildings, and they took no responsibility for the students whatsoever. The continental university tradition has been maintained, as has the English tradition. In fact, the English tradition is now expanding beyond Oxford and Cambridge to the point where the new universities are largely residential, and even the provincial universities are increasingly becoming residential universities, where the residential aspect of living and the educational aspects of living, as Mr. Kiley indicated, are not separate spheres but, in fact, are parts of a continuity of life.

Let us say that it is obvious that the English tradition was the tradition of the New England colleges. Certainly the Eastern schools have been influenced at their very outset with the idea of a residential community being the academic one also.

For various coincidental reasons, the growth of the land grant colleges, the growth of the Germanic influence, the continental influence on American colleges occurred at the same time that our great expansion of the state universities and the land grant colleges occurred. I am not sure that one is determined by the other, but in fact there are a lot of scholarly traditions that occurred, that grew in this country, research traditions that grew up on the continent, but also one of the traditions that developed was the idea that the universities are not residential, but they in fact are places of scholarship and research without residential base.

These traditions have been going on for a

long time in this country, parallel; and it seems to me clearly emerging of the two -- even those universities and colleges which have not been largely residential are increasingly looking at the residential aspect of their campus as part of the educational concern. Therefore, there is a great backlog in many places across the country for residential halls, far in excess of the growth of colleges and universities alone. In other words, places like the University of California are now embarking on a huge residential program. The University of Pennsylvania, which you may be familiar with, and others are now making up for this backlog, and there is an increasing commitment to the residential as well as to the academic facilities as part of education.

This means that attention is being given not only to the living, sleeping aspect of dormitories and residential halls, but to the educational values. The decisions being made, I think, increasingly are in terms of the residential system as a whole, and less and less on the basis of an individual dormitory. More and more campuses are looking at the entire system of dining halls, libraries, study halls, classroom and dormitory rooms as part of the whole system, and a decision as to the location of study halls, the location of dining, is not independent from their decision about the sleeping quarters.

This is particularly well thought out when attention is given to study halls, for example. In what I think was the pioneering effort that was made in Massachusetts for the development of the new college, Ritchie, Massachusetts, Amherst, Holyoke, that group, study facilities were given intensive research to see how students did, in fact, study; what their behavioral requirements were for study. You might not think this had much to do with residence halls, or with dining halls, or libraries, but it turned out that by concentrating on student behavior, on what they actually do, you find that they study in lots of different places. It is a common sense thing. In fact, you could plan a campus to make possible diverse choices of study places. You could plan the dormitories in this way, but you could also plan the dining halls in this way. Pretty soon you begin to realize that you are making double and triple use of space; that in fact the cost of a dining hall is partially the cost of a study hall. The cost of a library is, in fact, part of the cost of a study hall.

It comes across my mind that if they fall asleep in the library, does that mean it is also part of the dormitory? (Laughter) The point is that there is no way to make simple categories in terms of living.



You, in fact, have multiple choice, you have multiple use, and this is increasingly possible. It all really depends upon the establishment of objectives and goals. We have to become more and more precise about these goals and objectives. For example, the goals that are stated the simplest way, "Housing, 150 people"; "Housing, 750 people," do not come anywhere near close to being adequately stated. Are you intending that there be a close relationship, for example, between dormitory life and the kind of casual face to face relationships of groups that can easily occur? Are you trying to make of dormitory living something comparable to the scale of family life? Are you trying to establish some way of establishing a bridge between individual and group activities, which can occur naturally?

These things can all be done, and they are possible to do within the framework of any rational method of campus planning and environmental programming.

A few years ago, the American Council on Education proposed that the objective be this, and I would like to read this, what I think represents my goal, at least, for most student housing. "Student housing should be organized so that it does not constitute a large impersonal group from which the student may be inclined to withdraw. It should provide the natural environment where the student easily makes new friendships and finds a place in groups of congenial interests. A residential system should make possible the experiences in informal education which are commensurate with intellectual curiosity, the high regard for knowledge, and the maturity of judgment for which general academic discipline stands."

I want to point out, in a proposal once to Dean Patzer, that I thought that a properly planned residential unit would provide for each student a direct, personal experience of living in a civilized community. This is remarkably the same as Dan Kiley's comment earlier. There are many components to this community, and one can decide in a rational, objective way where to put the emphasis and where to allocate the resources.

Certainly one of the most important is to recognize the apparently diverse requirements of privacy, individual privacy on the one hand, and the need for multiple connections to community life, to a sense of group activity, on the other, and to make possible, through time, the choice of an individual to choose real privacy as against a choice of being a member of any number of groups that exist within the environment.

There is increasing evidence, from the

behavioral sciences, that the behavioral sciences are becoming much more interested in working with physical planners. There is increasing evidence that buildings have social value as well as economic value. From psychology and even from anthropology we are beginning to learn that buildings can be suitable or attractive to man, or they can be just the opposite. They can be inimical to man.

For example, it is possible to design a house in such a way that you really feel that it is home, that you feel that it is a nest, that it has all those idiosyncracies that make one feel that it is yours. But in order to do that, you always want to be able to move furniture around, to be able to kind of arrange it for yourself. The same kind of criteria should be applied to dormitory rooms. There is clear evidence that one of the major sources of dissatisfaction in dormitories is the inability for a student to move the furniture, to put things in such a way that he recognizes it is his. The same thing is true of a house.

It is possible to make buildings in such a way that you want to flee from them or through them. This is very much desirable in bus terminals and airports, where in fact the purpose of the building is to get you through it, to make it possible to come and go. To make of a bus terminal or an airport a place of loitering is actually to frustrate its fundamental purpose. Nevertheless, it is also possible to design a dormitory which is like a place that you want to flee from. Many dormitories have this quality of being always in transition. They are always going somewhere, but you never get there.

Many corridors have the feeling that you are not intended to be there. You are there by sufferance. It is possible to design corridors which make it seem a pleasant place, a human place to meet someone else, and not to feel that it is the basement of a skyscraper, or that you are in the middle of a submarine underwater.

It is possible to think of every single aspect of a building in terms of its impact on human behavior.

A friend of mine, who is an eminent psychiatrist (actually his main work is on the care of the mentally ill), he has pointed out to me a number of times that we know how to take care better of the mentally ill than we do of those of us who are at least partially well. He thinks that an aesthetic of a deeply satisfying and valuable kind can probably grow up when we start to think of ourselves as a very special

kind of animal, whose requirements are just as interesting, just as demanding, and probably just as important as the rarest creature in the finest zoo. The planning of residence halls and the planning of a college campus could be approached this way, but it has to be done by developing our programming methods. It is not a matter of visual stage setting. Too many times, I feel that the society looks upon architecture as a way of setting the stage for some glamorous world of the 18th century or of some other thing that needs to be expressed visually. In fact, all valid architecture which has a feeling of being right and necessary for our time cannot be developed that way at all. Architecture does not begin visually, and in fact, for most of us, it is experienced in much more than just visual terms. It is experienced in behavioral terms.

It seems to me that the rational planning method of dormitories would apply to all sorts of other aspects of the campus. It is necessary to identify those activities which need to be planned and to work hard at the identification of those activities.

Here let me just in summary state what I think are the five things that architects and campus planners need from you and from your colleagues, because clearly it is not a one man job. I would hope that this might be the kind of thing that you might be able to develop into a kind of clear, short statement of the hard core, absolute requirements of a situation, and not assume that it is your job to necessarily describe all the aspects of planning campuses or of planning dormitories. If you restrict yourself to the really essential things, the hard core things, then you can participate with your architect in the development of the comprehensive list of requirements.

We have gotten ourselves a little bit into the habit, that the only way in which we can deal with information is to put out an awful lot of it. Maybe it is the influence of the New York Times, where they print more than they need to print really. Many of our reports are too big. It would be very well to strike hard at the reversal of this direction and reduce things down to what you know are the absolute requirements for the planning.

Then, after this short list exists -- and hold the line on that -- then work with your architect and campus planners on the development of a more general thing. You will find in doing this that there are alternatives that you will be willing to accept which are equally valid, but which might fit better into the whole conception of the residence system or the college system. Do not try to make a very long and hard list. Make it a short, precise one.

Secondly, start always by analyzing the behavior, the use of existing facilities on your own campus or on neighboring campuses. Do not look at the architectural magazines, and do not look at the management magazines with the latest gimmicks. The main thing to do is to look really hard at how people do actually live and use buildings that you have right there. That is the best laboratory of experience you have. From that, and from a hard look at that, originality can come. If you do not have the buildings on the campus, find one or two that are fairly nearby and study those activities.

Human beings are by and large quite predictable. That is, if they are acting such and such a way on one campus, they are likely to be acting such and such a way on another. Classroom activity, dormitory activity is not so widely different. Start from understanding the human activities. You might even think about it in terms of what I would call the ecology of the campus; that is, the relationship of man and his environment, the organism and his environment, and there is an ecology of a dormitory; there is an ecology of a classroom; there is an ecology of a corridor. Most of all, try to identify the kind of organization of social and group behaviors that are existing.

See whether one kind of building gives rise to one kind of social and group behaviors as against others. See if there are obvious problems due to the physical organization that is related to the behavior organization. See if it is possible to reallocate the space that is available.

For example, suppose you are working at 120 square feet per student for a particular group of dormitories. It is possible to take that 150 square feet or 120 square feet, or whatever it is, and divide that pie up into different allocations. You can allocate more of it to rooms, or you can allocate more of it to lounges. You can allocate more of it to corridors. You can allocate more of it to counseling areas, and so forth.

Think of the entire space available to you, given the budget, and other limitations of our time, and see whether it is possible to reallocate it without rigid views initially. We found, for example, that the same amount of total square footage can be allocated into very, very different programmatic kinds of organization, so that some universities are going to have one kind of pattern of organization, and some another, and yet the total square footage will be the same.

Thirdly, bring all of your cost information up to 1966 dollars. It is almost impossible to talk intelligently to campus administrators and campus planners on the basis of a dormitory built five years ago that cost X dollars unless you have a comparable basis.

Also try to define as clearly as possible what is included in costs, and what is not included, so that it is clear to all concerned, your college trustees, and boards, and president, and so forth, and contractors and the architects. What do you mean by cost? Bring it all to a common base, and bring this, as much as possible, out in the open early. Architects, I think, are as aware as everyone else of the spiraling of the costs of construction and the necessity to deal with this at the outset and to have everything open.

The next proposal I would make is that you always try to have a small decision making group which is empowered to make decisions. This group, hopefully, not more than four or five people, should be the nucleus of making the decisions on campus planning, or of dormitory systems. The reason for the small group is that it is possible for the architect to build up enough understanding and rapport with the small group that he can present alternatives that can be freely and rationally discussed.

I think you should require of your architects alternatives -- not visual alternatives so much as programming alternatives; alternatives as to how to allocate the resources and how to organize, let's say, the group behavioral system of it. You will participate fully in this if it is a small working group.

Fourth, I think most of us would recognize that the landscape, the building, the circulation systems, the parking systems, the interior design, the furniture, and so forth, are all really one continuous part of the physical environment, and it is quite wrong to limit the assignment of your campus planners or architects arbitrarily. In particular, there is a tendency on the part of many universities and schools to separate the design of the interior and the design of the landscape from the design of the structures themselves. This, in many cases, leads to disaster.

The best situation, of course, is when the architects and the other disciplines are very sympathetic to each other and can work very well together. But in general, I think it is well to centralize

responsibility and to have one person, one group that can do the entire thing of landscape, interior, and buildings. I would even carry it further and require of them that they do graphics design. One of the terrible things happening in dormitories and buildings everywhere is the proliferation of signs and lights and so on. The control of the visual environment, or the making of it into a peaceful and quiet place is something that must be worked on, and worked on hard.

Fifth, and perhaps the most general of all, set up realistic objectives in terms of time. It is true that the government agencies and the funding and so forth puts extraordinary pressures on you, and it is true that you then put the pressures on the architects, and the architect then puts the pressures on the contractors. But in this pressure of time, something is lost in terms of understanding, in terms of decision making.

Set up a time schedule that is realistic, a time schedule for the programming, which is emerging as a major effort in this field, for the design, for the construction, and so forth. Set up a time schedule which allows for adequate reviews and participation by your own constituents, in your own groups, within the review process. I think this goes to the very heart of it.

It is more than a separate, isolated part of a job. Environmental programming requires dialog. It requires the presentation of alternatives, and the rational analysis of the benefits and the disadvantages and the costs of these alternatives. Increasingly, the field of architecture and planning is growing to accept the making of alternatives and the rational analysis of it. I think you should allow time for it because it not only will save money, but in the long run it is the only way of producing an adequate environment. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN PATZER: Thank you, Bob.

As you will note on the program, Dean Edward McGuire, from the University of Rhode Island, was scheduled to be the student personnel reactor. I received a telegram from Ed yesterday indicating that he had problems at Kingston, Rhode Island. So I asked William Swartzbaugh, who is Associate Dean of the College at Amherst, to step in, and he graciously agreed to do so. I think Bill brings to us a wealth of experience, having been on a large urban campus, to a fine, small community type of institution at Amherst. Bill, would you react.

DEAN WILLIAM L. SWARTZBAUGH (Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts): I am not sure "reactor" is a proper title in this case because I am inclined, from what I have heard, to agree with what these men have said, and perhaps because of the education I have received from a couple of architects who seem to agree with them. I am sure if Roland knew my own architectural experience he would not have invited me.

Last summer I designed the biggest building I had anything to do with. This was a two and a half car garage which had to provide for the care and nurture of a sailboat. (Laughter) At one end of that garage, in one corner, there is a trap door about this big, and that is because when you stick the mast in over the rafters at the other end, through a very large hole, it would not quite fit around diagonally into the garage, so you can poke it out this end, and back it in and close the little trap door. (Laughter) This is a personal note.

I do not have any architectural experience. I do not pretend to be an expert in these areas. But I have appreciated what I have learned from working with architects in two different institutions in designing very different kinds of residence halls. I am inclined to think, as Mr. Kiley suggested, about being free and not getting trapped into pre-conceptions of what ought to happen in situations, that is one of the healthiest things from the dean of students' point of view that he can hear an architect express. These were very carefully elaborated, I think, by Dean Geddes.

I think there is a tendency in many cases to find yourselves in the big end of a funnel and feel that there is a lot of room to maneuver, and realize suddenly that you are slipping down into one little narrow channel; and many of these residence halls and other buildings throughout the country reflect the conformist tendencies, or the tendency to come out that way, rather than as you work with architects, getting a sense of great freedom, and as I have experienced with one architect in Pittsburgh, the excitement of a young architect beginning to see all kinds of possibilities, in the case of a man who has not been involved in design of residence halls before.

I think my personal reactions are ones of real support because my involvement has been related to really involving students with architects in determining what people do, the way they behave, where they walk, who they run into, the circumstances under which they stop and talk, relationships that they have within a structure, the ways in which they are

sensitized, through all of their senses, through their environment -- all of these things are just the most exciting part of planning.

So I would say that I would hope that all of us pay attention to what students do do, and what their preferences are. I can think of one survey on a campus conducted with students with a carefully prepared survey which yielded, among other things, color preferences for four basic color combinations, these to be put in the suites in the dormitories. The architect-designer came up with two very different color combinations, and the resulting tete-a-tete resulted in his two being put in with these originally chosen four combinations, and all of these being submitted to a fine arts class, which is a fairly random group of students, and happily for the students the architect's color combinations were rejected, and in another go around, in other words, the students' preferences for colors were confirmed.

From what I understand here, these are men who appreciate this kind of help, who recognize that the people who are going to live there ought to be understood. I think where the student personnel administrator may come into this is perhaps supporting the architect in the ways that he has not thought of supporting him. There is no sense having an architect who is trying to provide for things which are visually stimulating in the dormitory, such as pictures, prints, wood cuts, tapestries; what have you, if you are bound by the physical plant director's prohibition of hanging anything on the wall, either because it has to be cleaned or it cannot be marred. This suggests certain kinds of walls, or picture rails, or long S hooks, or tackboard walls across the study room, or so forth.

DEAN GEDDES: Or ceilings. There is a high-rise building on one campus -- I won't mention which one -- where if you go to look you will see things pasted on the ceiling because they are not allowed to paste anything on the walls. (Laughter)

DEAN SWARTZBAUGH: Most of us have found that there are things that can be hooked with safety pins and thumbtacks and all kinds of ways for mobiles which are hung from the ceiling.

One of the other things which I will just suggest, and then I think be quiet, simply because I know this group has learned more from these gentlemen, I think sometimes we express our real values in the use of money on a campus. I think on most campuses there are some monuments to the wrong values, which



were required of architects who may have objected to these, but represent to the students, at a time when students are particularly perceptive of fraud of various kinds, a real abuse of the resources or misuse of the resources of the institution. We sometimes find these in overly elaborate stairwells, or particular arrangements of buildings which neither conform to the natural environment nor meet any functional need, nor seem to do anything else.

I would make the last point -- and this is not a question of reaction at all, but a hope to which I would like to get these gentlemen's reaction -- a hope that on any campus on which dormitory design at least is taking place, we consult with students. I personally have seen on two campuses most effective use of student participation -- full scale mock-up rooms developed, which have led to all kinds of improvements in the basic designs because they enabled people, the architects, to see how students are actually going to live in a new room. This may involve the selection or redesign of furniture. In one college it has a desk the likes of which could not be found in the educational sellers' laboratory, or anywhere else. It resulted from the use of several prototype desks which served the particular needs of this particular campus.

I think these mock-up rooms, where they can live in for a period of several weeks by different students, have often led to all kinds of savings due to the reduction of unnecessary expense, on the one hand, and the development of other types of facilities on the other. This is something which I think has been very exciting, where I have seen students participating in it.

CHAIRMAN PATZER: Thank you very much.

... A question and answer period followed ...

SEMINAR  
Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"The Non Student"

Seminar on "The Non Student," held in the Colonial Room, convened at three-thirty o'clock, Dean Warner Wick, Dean of Students, University of Chicago, presiding.

CHAIRMAN WICK: Our seminar this afternoon will be on the subject, "The Non Student." Our resource person, Mr. Watts, is a psychologist by trade. He went to Northwestern, got a Master's Degree at Illinois, went on to Columbia for his doctorate. His work on the Non Student is taking the form of a paper which he will present in September. He will give us a chance to have a preview of some of his work, and if he will go on for thirty-five minutes or so, we will then have a chance for a little discussion. Mr. Watts.

MR. WILLIAM A. WATTS (Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley): Thank you very much. "Non" seems to be the trend today. I noticed that the previous meeting was "Non-Violence," and today "The Non Student." Actually, "The Non Student" is probably not a terribly appropriate title for this, but unless you get into a very esoteric type of title, such as "The Berkeley Fringe," which may not have too wide a meaning, it is rather difficult to delineate this particular group. As a matter of fact, some 30 percent of them, of the ones that we sampled, were indeed students of one variety or another -- part time students taking a course, somehow officially categorizing themselves as students, and this was in the presumed non student sample, so I think this is sufficient to point out some of the ambiguities and problems in trying to even determine the parameters of a sample of this nature.

This group, if anyone is familiar with Berkeley, or with the Harvard underground, I think it is a very well known phenomenon and probably has been for at least fifty years, I would imagine, in several large university campuses in the United States, a group that is quite analogous, in many respects, to the so-called beat generation, or the Bohemian crowd, at least in outward appearance, and in terms of way of life, perhaps not so much in internal values, etc.

I became interested in this group through a previous study of the Free Speech advocates of a year ago, and the charge that so many of the Free Speech Advocates were these non students, and that there were many evil forces behind this whole Free Speech Movement, etc.

Actually, our study of the Free Speech advocates, in which we sampled 172, if I may digress for just one instant, showed that only 5 percent were non students. This bore up quite well with the District Attorney's final report that there were 10 percent non students. This discrepancy of 5 percent, which is probably not a major source of worry anyhow, can probably be accounted for by the fact that between the time we sampled them in the afternoon and by the time the actual arrests started taking place the next morning, that a disproportionately greater number of students than non students left the building because of the fact that they had much more to lose -- their status as students. They were much more susceptible to punitive action on the part of the university administration, and what have you.

At any rate, by this time I became interested in the non student and this group which is very obvious around the University of California, on Telegraph Avenue particularly. As Dr. Wick pointed out, it is not at all unusual to have them confused as students. In fact, the administration, I think sometimes in ire, points out that they are eating the university food and enjoying the luncheons. Dr. Powell, the Director of the Health Clinic, made the statement (simply paraphrasing it from Time Magazine approximately a year ago) that probably there is no place, at least in America, where there is a more ideal place for a person to drop out of a system, in the sense that these people seem to have done, and subsist for a year or two in quite pleasant circumstances, with a minimal amount of money.

They are in a position where they can take advantage of many university facilities, and they are in a fairly idyllic climate, in many respects. They can borrow on a friend's library card and make use of the library, make use of the medical facilities, and enjoy relatively inexpensive lunches, etc. We do not know how many make use of these facilities but if this is an adequate introduction, let me launch into the study in particular.

Alienation has historically been a topic of great interest and classically defined in terms of socio-economic status, in the alienation of middle-class values, etc., of the lower socio-economic group through no fault of their own, but simply because they were unable to achieve these values, or by Marxian terms, a man's alienation from his work. But today, there is increasing attention being paid to the sort of vague feelings of anomie, or alienation, or normlessness, lack of self-to-others-belongingness, that people have been talking about, I think, throughout these

meetings. For example, the luncheon meeting today, Kenniston's book on some 12 extremely alienated students at Harvard that he followed up in a psychiatric clinic, over a period of several years, I think illustrates this point very well. Here are students who for all objective purposes come from rather elite socio-economic statuses, and yet they are suffering from this type of feeling of being uncommitted, dis-affiliated. You are probably well aware this is an extremely treacherous and ambiguous term, "alienation," in terms of alienated from what? But here we will operationally define it in terms of two scales, one being Leo Stral's scale of anomie, which gets at a psychological dimension of self-to-others-belongingness; and the other being a scale in omnibus personality inventory, which is an instrument developed over the last eight or nine years at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. Those are primarily under Paul Heist's sponsorship.

This is an instrument, as the name implies, that is specifically designed for getting at all aspects of an individual's personality and particularly appropriate for college-age youth. As one psychologist friend of mine said, he was quite impressed with it because he could give it to college students without blushing. It did not have all of the items of fancying crawling insects, or what have you, that some of its better known counterparts might have. At any rate, this instrument was used in a survey type study of this group, along with a 30 page questionnaire, getting at a number of dimensions, it seemed, of theoretical and practical interest.

Later I will go over the various scales. There are 14 in the omnibus personality inventory at the moment. We can simply leave it in terms of it also getting at alienation, or the obverse of it, personal integration, the degree to which a person is not alienated, does not feel in this normless sense of non-attachment to fellow man, etc.

The other instruments that we utilized (and depending upon the time, we may be able to discuss it briefly) was the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey study of values, and the Strong vocational interest blank, which we cannot talk about, at least to any extent, because it has not as yet been completed in terms of the scoring, and also Goss adjective check list, which is similarly in this position of not having been completed at the moment.

The sample that we drew consisted of 151 members of this Bohemian fringe element, and we used a technique which has been colorfully referred to by

Campbell and Pettigrew as a snowball technique, since, as I previously mentioned, this was a population whose substance is shifting with time. It appears to be rather transient in many respects. It is impossible to, in any scientific sense, delineate a particular universe and draw scientifically a random sample from it. So, turning to the only apparent technique to us, with all of its difficulties, we utilized a number of inlets or accesses to this sample that we had available; namely, a number of people whom we knew to varying degrees, who were members of this culture, at least on close acquaintance with the culture.

We also utilized a method of putting up rather artistic posters. The "artistic" may seem totally irrelevant, but if you know these people it is not irrelevant. This is all I can say. But we put up a series of posters on Telegraph Avenue, mentioning the nature of the study; to come to a particular building -- first, to contact us, and then to come to a particular university building, which they kindly made available to us, and they would be paid \$5.00 for their participation, plus getting a feedback of the results, in a sort of general sense -- their scores in some of the particular inventories.

Our guess was that the \$5.00 would be of considerable importance to these non students because, again, rumor had it that they lived in a most economical fashion; and indeed our data indicated that only a small minority of them are employed in any sense (some 25 percent), and of these only half again of this number -- in other words, some 15 percent -- are employed in anything approximating full time, over 32 hours a week.

So to get away from the extreme bias that might be introduced just from the people who want to be studied -- a sort of Hawthorne effect -- we had the funds made available to us, and offered the \$5.00 payment for both the students and the non students.

We had anticipated considerable difficulty in getting our sample, from Wrigley and Smith's book, "The Real Bohemian," in which they trapped down some 50, if my memory serves me correctly, members of the famous San Francisco and North Beach Bohemian group -- I trust it is famous. They think it is, at any rate. They found a great deal of reticence on the part of these people to divulge information about themselves and only with much time and energy were they really able to get any access to the group. We were planning on these problems.

As a matter of fact, we had only asked for

funds to run 40 of these people through the rather intensive materials, but luckily, funds were not that scarce, and it became a problem of shutting them off once we had received the adequate number. I have no doubt on earth we could run 600 people through the questionnaire if we had the funds to pay the \$5.00 a head -- which by that time was adding up.

In the first place, I feel that these non students -- you must pardon this expression, because 61 percent of them had completed one to three years in college, and another 11 percent had already graduated from college, so for all practical purposes they had completed their education -- they had completed at least a particular course, but instead of taking up meaningful occupations, etc., they had fled into this sort of background, probably temporarily.

At any rate, with no difficulty we obtained 151 members of this group. As I mentioned, we had quite a bit of difficulty in discouraging other people. I think, for one thing, they were somewhat interested in being studied, probably because of the fact that they tended to be rather high on estheticism, from all indications, and sort of quasi-philosophers, very interested in their own characteristics and dispositions, quite artistically oriented, etc. I think they were almost more compelled to come take part in this study from the feedback of information -- at least from the feedback that we have received from them -- than from the \$5.00, although this was surely important as well.

By this time we have depleted so much of our funds that we were forced into the position of only measuring 56 students as a cross section on the Berkeley campus. But here there was no problem in obtaining a true random sample by simply going to the student directory and drawing names, contacting them by telephone, explaining the nature of the study to them in precisely the same terms as we had to the non students, offering them \$5.00 remuneration as a token honorarium for their participation, etc.

Of the students that we contacted, 77 percent agreed to come and actually showed up. There was a slight bias that we might have people among the students also that are slightly more positive, inclined to be studied, or slightly less busy, or what have you. The typical excuse given was the time involved, since this particular thing took from three to four hours to go through the various measures.

In terms of some preliminary descriptions of the sample, before we turn to the major sub-headings--

incidentally, any time you have questions please do not hesitate to interject them at any time -- the samples tended to be almost identical in terms of the sex ratio of males to females. On the University of California campus approximately one-third of the population is female. Thirty-two percent of the sample of non students that we drew were females. The age distributions of the two samples were very close together; approximately half of both being under 20 years of age, although in the case of the non student males, this proportion fell somewhat, and 34 percent were under 20 years of age.

Marital status was quite similar; about the same proportion being married in each of the samples.

Another question of considerable interest was the period of time that they had been in the Berkeley area; whether they were extremely transient, had been attracted out there, migrated to the area temporarily because of the publicity received due to the Free Speech Movement, or whether instead they were more stable members of this area. Well, 46 percent of the males and 26 percent of the females said that they had lived near the Berkeley campus area for less than six months, indicating that the population certainly was quite transient. Approximately 16 percent of each fell in the 7 months to a year category. And another 17 percent responded "About two years." Approximately 13 percent had lived in the area 2 to 5 years. And finally, 10 percent of the males, and a sizeable 26 percent of the females had lived near the Berkeley campus for over five years.

Although this indicates a good deal of movement and a fairly transient population, there appears to be a hard core that are quite stable. Actually, I was rather surprised to find, and may again be a bias in our sample, that there had not been a larger proportion that had been in the area for 5 years or longer because an anthropologist whom I know quite well at Berkeley had just, from incidental observation, estimated that many of these people had been there about 15 years that he could count himself. He had been seeing them around the campus. But again, these are probably relatively few and sort of colorful figures, like one person who has been around the Columbia campus, I'm sure, for at least 40 years, and possibly longer, who stands out in front of "Chock Full O' Nuts" and tries to recruit adherents to his causes, whichever they happen to be, never with any success. But one or two of these colorful kind of individuals, I think, may distort the permanency of the group; they are so obvious themselves.

Well, this would suggest that the females might very well have been -- from the sample that we drew -- residents of the Bay Area, more so than the males; and this turned out to be the case, that 31 percent of the females, compared to 16 percent of the males, had spent their childhood in the Bay Area. So this larger proportion of the females that had been there over 5 years in part is due to the fact that a larger proportion of the females had been raised in the Bay Area as children and had, in one manner or another, drifted into this particular sub-culture.

In addition to the time of residence in the Berkeley campus area, another index of their permanency or commitment to this way of life is how long they had been out of school. Here again we asked them "When was the last time you were formally registered in an institution, a university?"

Thirty-nine percent of the males and 47 percent of the females had been last enrolled just the previous year. Thirty-three percent of the males and 20 percent of the females were last enrolled in 1964; approximately 11 percent of each in 1963; 12 percent in 1960 to '63, and 6 percent of each sex had been last enrolled in the university prior to 1960 -- in a university or college.

So, again, you get the same kind of a picture of relative newcomers to this way of life; in general but a small nucleus that has apparently been committed to it for some time.

There were no differences in terms of highest grade in school that the parents had completed, father's occupation, father's income, according to their estimate, etc.

As you might expect, the proportion of the non students that had majored, when they had been in college, for this 72 percent altogether that had been in college to some degree, beyond one year, counting the 11 percent who completed it, you found a tremendous over-representation in the creative or fine arts. Twenty-five percent of the non students, one-quarter of the entire group, had been majoring in the fine arts, the creative arts, as compared to 7 percent of the students. The humanities also provided a very large number; 38 percent of the non students had been humanities majors, compared to 28 percent of the students.

As you would again expect -- in fact, it would almost be demanded by these disproportionate frequencies, the non students were very much under-



represented in the more pragmatic fields, and scientific fields. In the social sciences, interestingly enough, they were almost identical; 26 percent non students, and 30 percent of the students.

Turning to the topic then of alienation and anomie as measured by these particular instruments, I might just quickly say that you can actually make a case almost for either position here. That is probably the most beautiful of all positions for a social scientist to be in. No matter what comes out, he has a ready interpretation.

At any rate, you can argue that if these people are really committed to social reform and are cohesively united behind some goal that they are going to try to get across, whatever this might be -- forceful overtaking of some segment of the university (I am only speaking facetiously here, of course) -- but under some kind of circumstance like this, that this should then breed a cohesive type of group structure; and indeed we have some evidence of this in the Free Speech Movement.

In the Paul Heist study of the Free Speech Movement, in which he gave the omnibus personality inventory to a sample of the people who had been arrested, he did find, interestingly enough, that these people, while they were avowedly alienated to the institution at that point, they scored lower on anomie, according to the OPI scale, than just a cross section of the student body, but I am quite sure not significantly so. He did not run significance tests on this, but here at least would be some evidence to support this idea that here is a group that are united behind the goal that they are fighting for, and they tend to consequently feel quite cohesive, and a high degree of personal integration, as this particular scale is named.

From the other standpoint, any analogy, say, to the beat generation, etc., would probably lead you to believe that these people would be high on anomie, and it turns out to be that they are high on anomie according to both measures. In the Stral's scale, the non students are significantly more anomic. The means for the group, if you have any interest, was 1.37 for the students, which fits in very closely with other norms obtained, for example, by Mizrocky in his studies of New York State, and McClosky in his studies of other personality variables related to the anomie. Whereas, the non student mean was 2.52. This yields a T test of 6.76, significantly well beyond the 01 level.

Similarly, on the personal integration scale

of the OPI, here a low score indicating anomy, you find the same general results. They are significantly more anomic on this measure as well.

Hensley's data would indicate that the non students feel more alienated toward their fellow man, as well as harboring more apparent alienation from prevalent social norms. This is more an anecdotal observation, considering that they tend to go against the common prevalent social norms from all manners, almost, from their attire to having entered a more conventional type of occupation, or having continued their education.

From the greater anomy experienced by these people, you might assume that they would have more strained family relations, or a greater degree of estrangement with their family. Again here, we might argue on the other side; however, this does not necessarily have to be the case, that this greater alienation toward prevalent social norms, and so forth, may simply be something that is inculcated by the family, that the family themselves have been protesters, and what have you, and that the non students here are very similar to the parents in terms of agreeing on major issues, such as ideological matters, future goals, ambitions, and this type of thing.

In the first index at getting at this, it was simply asking them, on a scale, a number of responses -- I should say, it really does not constitute a scale -- the frequency of their contact with their parents, in terms of personal contact, by mail, and telephoning, etc. On these various measures, frequency of personal mail and so forth, contact with the parents, how often they write home, how often they receive letters, you will find that the non students are significantly lower than the students. They tend to have quite considerably less contact with the home on any of these various measures.

If anyone is interested, I will go over the exact figures on this; otherwise, we will turn to others.

Given that they have less frequent contact, you can ask the question then, in terms of the amount of contact that they do have, are they inclined to frequently discuss important areas of life? This is an arbitrary judgment on our part in terms of what constitutes important areas of life. My colleague in this entire study, co-author and collaborator, David Whitaker, and I, chose the following terms of intellectual ideas: religious beliefs, personal problems, future goals, and political beliefs.

On all of these, except the religious beliefs, the non students tend to discuss them less frequently, or at least they say they do, with their parents than do the students. So again, you get this very consistent relationship in all of these areas of less contact between the children and the parents in the case of the non students than the students.

The next question that we asked --

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Could I ask a question?

MR. WATTS: Surely.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: How do you account for the exception of religion there in the response that you were getting?

MR. WATTS: From my personal observation, I feel that for the Berkeley campus, at least conventional religious values are probably less important -- well, that is not just personal observation. Well, I guess it is too. I do not have any comparison with exactly the same questions. But they are less important than in other institutions, such as the Midwest; and consequently, this is not a matter of a great deal of discussion between children and parents in either case. However, in terms of disagreement, they did tend to disagree more about religion than the students did, which is the next topic. But other than this, I have no explanation for it; just my own bias.

I perceived the students at Berkeley as not being very conventionally religious. I am saying that is probably why the students are also low, and consequently you get no difference between the students and the non students because I don't think the students are too much oriented in this direction.

One place where I am sure information could be obtained on this would be in some of Heist's studies on different campuses using the OPI, in which there is a religious orientation measure with it. But unfortunately, I do not have that information with me.

This next topic, however, the disagreement or agreement between children and parents, here you could argue, as, in fact, I already have, that you might either find very little agreement, where there is a further indication of the parental estrangement, or that they had relatively less contact with the parents, and furthermore they disagree with them in terms of important values. Or, as I have already mentioned, you might argue that these people are simply products of parents who have been dissenters themselves and, consequently, have a high degree of agreement. But from

the data previously reported, namely this lesser contact between the children and parents in the case of the non students, this did not seem too tenable. It seemed more likely there would be numerous disagreements, and this indeed turns out to be the case.

In terms of the disagreements, the four dimensions that we looked at were, again, religious beliefs, intellectual beliefs, political beliefs, and future goals. Yes, intellectual ideas, religious beliefs, future goals, and political beliefs. In this case, we deleted personal problems as not being too appropriate for agreements or disagreements.

On all of these measures you will find very large differences between the students and non students in terms of their extent of agreement with their parents on these matters, with the non students always being less in agreement with their parents than the students; a greater degree of disagreement.

From this evidence, then, it clearly appears to be that the non students are more estranged from their families, less in agreement than the students.

One further bit of data bearing on this was the question asking them, "In the recent past, have disagreements tended to increase, decrease, or remain about the same between you and your parents?" Here, again, the two samples differed quite significantly, with the non students being more inclined to say they had increased, and clearly not to say that they had decreased; with the students reporting 14 percent having increased, and 29 percent decreased, and 57 percent "No change." Thirty-two percent of the non students reportedly had increased; 30 percent "No change," and 38 percent that they had decreased.

The next general area that we looked at was in terms of attitude toward formal education, because here you find a very interesting kind of situation. These people, from all comments and indications that you might obtain, hold learning in the highest of esteem -- again, here, largely from anecdotal observation, although it is more than anecdotal observation. For example, in the Weisman's technique, categorizing people in terms of intellectual disposition, on the basis of Strong vocational interest blank, this much has been scored at this point, and 30 percent of the non students fall in the highest measure of intellectual disposition, whereas no student falls in this category, according to this technique.

I must hasten to add that there have been numerous critics of Weisman's technique, Harold Carter

being one of the main workers on the Strong vocational interest blank, 20 years ago, being one of the leading critics of this technique. It consists of rating them in terms of occupations that presumably are high in terms of intellectual interest and getting a composite index of this blank.

At any rate, from their comments -- as a matter of fact, "A student of life" was obtained from their very frequent comments. When they were asked in open ended questionnaires, "What do you do? What do you want to do?" "A student of life" was quite a common type of comment, and by all appearances, they appear to hold education in very high esteem; but we might suspect also from their comments that they tend to be quite antagonistic toward formal education, and this indeed turns out to be the case.

In response to the question, "How well satisfied are you or were you with your formal education," of the student sample, 70 percent said they were satisfied; 5 percent that they were neutral; and 25 percent said they were dissatisfied. A much different distribution was obtained for the non students, with a mere 26 percent (compared to 70 percent) stating that they were satisfied; 13 percent neutral; while the majority, 61 percent, stated that they were dissatisfied. This distribution, of course, is highly significant.

The second item asked the respondent to state his degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement, "Having or having had the opportunity to go to college is very important to me." Almost all, 89 percent of the students, strongly agreed with the statement; 9 percent moderately agreed; and 2 percent were uncertain or disagreed. In contrast, among the non students, roughly half, 58 percent, strongly agreed that this was of great importance to them; 21 percent moderately agreed; and 21 percent were uncertain or disagreed.

The respondents were also asked, "How many instructors do you think take a personal interest in their students?" The students responses were about evenly divided here, with 32 percent saying that most of them did; 34 percent saying about half; and 34 percent saying few or none. In contrast, for the non students, only 16 percent claimed that most instructors take a personal interest; 24 percent thought about half did; and a majority, 60 percent, stated few or none. Here again is a significant difference in trend.

In addition to these series of questions,

10 were included in a "Yes," "No," variety, in terms of getting at attitudes toward formal education and, more specifically, education at the University of California. I will read these off rather hastily and give you the percentages on the ones that are significant.

"On the whole, U.C. is doing a good job." Ninety-three percent of the students agree with this; 62 percent of the non students. This difference is significant.

"Most of what I am formally learning or have learned in college is very worthwhile." Seventy-seven percent of the students agree with this; 39 percent of the non students. Again significant.

"In many ways, U.C. does not keep up with the times." Seventeen percent of the students say, "Yes," to this; 54 percent of the non students say, "Yes." Again, quite significant.

"I think that formal college education does not really equip you for life outside the campus in a way that it could." Thirty-eight percent of the students say "Yes" to this; 85 percent of the non students. Again significant.

"The University of California has the best system of college education in the United States of America." No difference between students and non students here. A slight trend for students to be more inclined to say "Yes," but nothing significant.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Did they each tend to think that it was the best college in the U.S.A.?

MR. WATTS: No, they did not. I had better brush up on that. Twenty-seven percent of the students and 15 percent of the non students said "Yes." (Laughter)

"Too many college teachers lack respect for religious values." No difference. Neither felt that was any problem. Sixteen percent of the students say "Yes," and 22 percent of the non students. Again, my interpretation of this is in terms of relatively low interest, as far as I can ascertain, in conventional religion among the students as well. This would hardly be a place where the non students would tend to pick this up.

"I do not have as much respect for a college education as I did before I went to college." Students, 21 percent say "Yes"; non students, 64 percent. That is significant.

"College education does more to break down values than to build them up." Students, 21 percent say "Yes," and non students, 44 percent. Significant.

"I think college teachers are unwilling to openly say what they really believe." Students, 17 percent say "Yes"; non students, 63 percent. Significant.

"I think that most courses encourage and foster scholarship and creative thought rather than merely requiring memorization of facts." Sixty percent of the students say "Yes" -- being very kind, no doubt -- and 30 percent of the non students say "Yes." Again, a significant difference.

One might look at this and make at least two interpretations. One would go something to the effect that these non students are particularly astute and socially conscious individuals. For example, Linus Pauling, in the conference held in Beverly Hills, said that the student protesters are not protesting against morality, but adult immorality. Goodman has also stated that it is a situation of moral youth in an immoral society, if you will pardon my paraphrasing of it. So here would be one interpretation of these data. These ex-students, most of them, are simply especially socially conscious and feel that education is really not doing the job that it should, and have terminated either permanently or temporarily their education for this reason and, consequently, are legitimately protesting.

The other interpretation would be that these students were somehow, either due to intellectual ability or personality, incapable of going through the somewhat rigorous and lengthy and, to whatever degree it is, demanding aspects of formal education. Consequently, for these idiosyncratic reasons, they have dropped out of the system and that this represents nothing but a howl of rationalization. They are rationalizing the reason that they dropped out.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: You did not find out on your questionnaire the reason for their dropping out? You are speculating --

MR. WATTS: We have some material on this, but unfortunately we have not analyzed any of this, in terms of open ended questionnaire material. It looks like it is almost impossible to analyze in the first place, I might say. Many of them, in this particular case, make statements about the dogmatism, rigidity, etc. Many of the students do as well. So I do not know whether it will be really significant or not.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: It might be rather significant to know whether these students failed out and whether they just could not make it.

MR. WATTS: Yes. Well, we do have some data on this. Here we do have some data, although my personal belief would be that it would not be too profitable to ask them because they might very well be inclined to give a favorable impression and say, "Well, we dropped out," or what have you. But we did give a rather crude measure of intelligence. Time pressures were extreme and we wanted to give a test that would require an hour to give; however, since there is a fairly brief scale, requiring approximately 20 minutes, by Thorndyke, giving a verbal fluency, which correlates rather highly with other rather longer measures of intelligence, this Thorndyke word list is a specific one and we decided to use it.

Again, I must say that it certainly is crude but it may be useful in this kind of a sense of differentiating between two groups. If you want to make some very precise kind of statement about within the group, that this person is higher by so much, or lower by so much, it would not be too useful. But it has a reliability of .85, roughly -- .8, .85 -- and this we did give.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: If they were ex-U.C. students, couldn't you check their records?

MR. WATTS: Well, the big majority of them were not U.C. students. This we do not have recorded, in terms of what the previous institution was -- just a geographical location. As you would expect, probably, a disproportionately large number of them did come from around California -- not necessarily right around the Bay Area but a diminishing proportion as you got farther and farther away -- but a great number of them came from the East, from New York, from Boston. As a matter of fact, it is quite interesting, in the requests for information that we get from them in this follow-up that we told them we would give them back, materials we sent out, postcards, not long ago, telling them that if they are still interested in the materials we would be sending these out in packets to a lot of people who would be moving and would leave no forwarding address, and they should simply send us a self-addressed manila envelope and we would put the materials in there and send it to them. We certainly are getting an extreme picture of how transient the group is on that basis, because the requests come from all over the country, from the East, the Middlewest, etc.

According to this one index that we do have,



the Thorndyke word list, it clearly is not any lack in intellectual ability that is causing the drop out in school, because they score virtually identically with the student sample, the cross section of the students.

Furthermore, in case anyone would think that with 56 people perhaps you got a bizarre sample, although it was randomly drawn, these scores were just, for all practical purposes, identical to norms that Minor collected across the nation in terms of various educational levels. They scored just like college students typically do, and that is that they have a mean of about 14.63, 14.17, for females and males respectively, which is virtually identical to the norms.

This would indicate then that it is not that they are not up to college caliber, but it certainly does not have anything to say about what idiosyncratic reasons there might be that predisposed them toward dropping out.

Another area that was of great interest, which we will turn to now unless someone has some specific question on the attitudes toward education -- yes?

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: This question will reveal my unfamiliarity with sociological technique, but may I ask, what allowance should you make toward the fact that the respondents, particularly non students, may be playing games with you?

MR. WATTS: Well, the only evidence we have about playing games is the lie scale that is built into the omnibus personality inventory, and they are significantly more honest, according to the scale, than the students. They give a more candid response. They score less like a person does when he is told to respond in a favorable light, to give a good impression, than the students do, which actually would fit in, sort of, with just their general appearance in life. If they were terribly interested in giving a good appearance in general, I think they would not, for example, dress the way they do, etc.

... A question and answer period followed ...

SEMINAR SESSION  
Monday Afternoon - June 27, 1966

"The Deans' Assumptions: Some  
Issues for the Profession"

The Seminar Session, meeting in the Evergreen and Pacific Rooms, convened at three-thirty o'clock, Dr. Peter Armacost, Program Director, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C., presiding.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: I think we will begin, inasmuch as we need every minute we can get in order to cover the material that we would like to discuss with you this afternoon.

As you know from the program, our purpose here is to give you a preliminary report of our exploratory investigation of selected assumptions and beliefs of student personnel administrators. I should say at the outset that really what we are trying to do is present to you today the raw data and to react to it in your presence, along with you, with the promise that in the fall there will be a rather extensive report of this exploratory investigation -- and I would remind you that that is all that it was -- at which time we will give you some idea of the plans that we have for follow-up activity.

Since you have not had an opportunity to read the report which we are distributing at the door, I will take a few minutes to acquaint you with our purposes in this investigation and with our research strategy. It reminds me of a story which President Tate of Southern Methodist told a week ago in a similar situation. Two truck drivers, Joe and LeRoy, worked for a safety minded company, and Joe and LeRoy were being subjected to a little quizz as to what they would do in certain crises situations, to see how well they responded. They asked Joe what he would do if he were at the top of the hill and saw down at the very bottom of the hill a very narrow bridge which was only wide enough for one truck to pass, and at the same time, in his view as he glanced up, at the top of the next hill he saw another semi-trailer truck coming toward that same bridge.

He quickly calculated that both trucks would arrive at the narrow bridge at the same time and there would not be room for both of them to pass. Without batting an eye, Joe's response was, "I'd wake up LeRoy." "Well, why would you do that? What is the purpose in that?" "Well, LeRoy has never seen a wreck and I'd like to wake him up so he can see his first wreck." (Laughter)

In a sense, we think our job here is to partially wake people in NASPA up to some of the issues which face us as we are employed in the profession of student personnel work. We hope that in the process of doing this we do not make a prophet out of Tom Emmett's secretary who was typing badges. As you know, they have trouble with some of these long titles and words on some of these narrow cards. In the process of shortening the "Association of American Colleges," they came up with "Ass." as an abbreviation for the word "Association." We hope that is not prophetic.

The purpose of this investigation was four-fold. We were hoping, first, to identify the assumptions of members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators on a number of issues important to the profession. Second, to determine how widely these are held by deans of students and other student personnel administrators who belong to NASPA. Third, to stimulate NASPA members to re-examine their assumptions and to discuss with their colleagues many of the issues raised, however obliquely, in the survey instrument. Fourth, to identify topics for more extensive and systematic empirical investigation with such methods as a "critical incidents" approach, on the one hand, and for philosophical position papers, on the other.

There was an additional more long-range objective of this exploratory investigation. Namely, to provide a basis for initiating discussions with behavioral scientists who could comment on the assumptions of student personnel administrators from the perspective provided by behavioral science theory and research. Similar comments from representatives of other academic disciplines may be sought as well. Hopefully, such comments will assist the student personnel administrator who is evaluating his assumptions by either reinforcing them as a basis of action or forcing a revision of those which are both idiosyncratic and without empirical or theoretical support from the relevant academic disciplines.

We would like to take the opportunity to describe to you at some other occasion how we have taken some initial steps to this end and we hope that there is some promise of fruit.

For the purposes of this exploratory investigation we collected data by means of a 27 item questionnaire. Each item consisted of a statement to which the respondent selected one of the following six forced-choice responses: strongly agree, agree, agree with reservations, disagree with reservations, disagree, strongly disagree. The respondent was asked to specify the nature of his reservations whenever he chose the

third or fourth alternatives and space was provided for this purpose. In addition, all respondents were invited to use the available space to write any comments which they wished to make regardless of their response to the initial statement. Many NASPA members offered instructive comments in response to this invitation.

The exploratory nature of this investigation and the particular combination of objectives for the study led to two elements of the research strategy which should be noted. First, in order to stimulate discussion the statements were deliberately worded, in some instances, in a provocative fashion. Second, the desire to have NASPA members actually take a position on the issues raised in the questionnaire dictated the absence of response categories such as "uncertain," "cannot say," "don't know," or "haven't given it enough thought." As a result, some respondents chose not to answer some of the items, but in all but two cases this was less than four percent of the respondents and in no case was it greater than six percent.

The questionnaire was sent to twenty NASPA members as a pilot study prior to more general distribution and the results suggested changes in the wording of several statements and in the nature of the response alternatives which were incorporated in the final form of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was mailed on January 10, 1966 to all persons on the NASPA mailing list as of January 1, 1966. Thus, 691 questionnaires were distributed to NASPA members, 416 (60%) of which were returned by the deadline. A follow-up letter to the non-respondents (except for 30 in non-campus assignments, such as fraternity secretaries) yielded another 116 questionnaires, for a total response of 522 (76%). Since four of these were received after we conducted our data analysis, the results of the study are based on 518 completed questionnaires.

What we propose to do today is deal with these in a number of general categories which, to some extent, reveal what we consider to be the logical relationship between some of these questions and, as I say, simply present the results in raw data form, and react to them in your presence. For the purpose of this exercise -- and we hope there will be plenty of time for questions -- we have asked the members of the Division Advisory Board to each take a section of the questionnaire and deal with it as briefly as we can. So in this order, and without further ado, I would like to ask Jack Graham, the Dean of Students at Southern Illinois University, to take the first section; I will then deal with an additional section of questions; Thomas Dutton, the Dean of Students at Oakland Univer-

sity, in Michigan, will deal with the third set of questions; and Phillip Tripp of the U.S. Office of Education will be our anchor man.

Our plan at the moment is to proceed through the initial presentation, and then stop for questions and answers for the remainder of the time. If you wish to alter this procedure and it seems desirable we are, I hope, flexible. Jack, do you want to lead off.

DEAN JACK W. GRAHAM (Southern Illinois University): In an effort to let you become a bit more familiar with the report, I am going to try to deal with this as raw data and try to help you with the report which Dr. Armacost has so ably prepared and put in your hands. If you will turn to Table I, the long sheet at the end of the report, this you will see is a summary of the questionnaire which many of you helped to complete, but it has been put together in a form that gives a little logical hanging together.

I might just add that the form that you see under categories was arrived at after the questionnaire was filled out at a second meeting of our group, in an effort to see if there were some kinds of responses and some type of comments that sort of pulled a certain set of questions together. This differentiation under these topics is quite arbitrary and should not be thought of as the last statement because some of these could very well fall under more than one category.

If you will, take a look then at the data under questions 1, 6, 3, 14, 5, and 12. I will read the full question for you so that you get some idea of what it is like, and then you will notice that you have in front of you the number who strongly agreed, those who agreed, agreed with reservations, disagreed with reservations, disagreed, and strongly disagreed; and then, those who did not mark the answer. Then the total percent agreed and the total percent that disagreed are in terms of the three categories on either side, omitting then the "No answer." So that if you want to add up to 100 percent, the difference here is that which did not answer. So that will give you some idea of interpreting Table I.

Just hurriedly, then, let me go ahead and read item one so that you get some idea of what this means. Item one is: "It is the primary responsibility of Student Personnel Administration to support consistently the central functions of the college or university which are teaching and research." Now, you will notice here that 92 percent tend to agree with this statement, and 6 percent tend to disagree. Some of the comments that were made that reflect this particular comment are that they would prefer different word-

ing. I suspect that there are several of you who would have preferred a different wording on several of these particular items, either to clarify your own feelings or to give vent to some of your ambivalence as it relates to some of the concepts.

Another comment was that there are additional major responsibilities for Student Personnel Administration; and nine people came up with the comment that these are not the central functions. Now, what does that mean?

We will move on to item number two in this particular group, which happens to be, really, item number 6 of the questionnaire. "The major justification for any claim to an educational role for student personnel administrators rests on the assumption that the student functions as a unit and cannot be categorically separated into the 'intellect' and the rest of the person." Here again, we find strong agreement, with 86 percent of the respondents tending to agree, and 11 percent tending to disagree.

One of the comments said this reflects just one of the many reasons that can be used in terms of the educational role of the student personnel administrator.

The third item, which then goes back to number 3 of the questionnaire, has to do with responsibility of the student personnel administrator. "Part of the responsibility of the Student Personnel Administrator to the student is to provide relatively accurate and complete information about that student to outside agencies making a legitimate inquiry about the student." Here again, we find fairly strong agreement, with some of the comments being that we should have the student's permission; and it depends on the legitimacy of the request.

The next three items you will notice that there is less agreement than in the first three in this particular category. Perhaps some of the reason for our disagreements is either in the wording of the item or in what issues are subtly a part of these particular items. In item 14, the full item of the questionnaire is this: "At times there may be good administrative reasons (other than danger to the individual or to others in society) for violating the confidentiality of a counseling relationship without the permission of the student." Here we find that we have 24 percent agreeing and 73 percent disagreeing.

Some of the comments were that if it serves the best interests of the student then this might be

permissible, but they had difficulty thinking of the kinds of cases where this would be true. Someone asked, "What is really confidential in terms of how the dean may perceive it, in terms of the many kinds of things that deans receive in the course of a conversation, and what the student perceives is confidential?" I think there was also the idea of at least the exception of discussing a case with a colleague as being one of the valid administrative reasons; and yet under the APA statement this is not breaking confidentiality in terms of discussing a case with a colleague. So maybe there is still general consensus here of disagreeing with this particular statement.

Then coming on to number 5, the dean as a controller. The full statement reads: "The common perception of the Dean as controller and limiter of student freedoms may well have negative implications for his future in higher education." Here again, you will notice that 58 percent agree and 39 percent disagree.

These are some of the comments that came in. "I would agree if we are really perceived this way. This is a misperception which deans must change." And, "If the dean administers his program well, with education for understanding of freedom and responsibility, there should be few if any negative effects."

So here again we have a variety of comments and yet quite a wide spread in terms of the concept of the dean as controller.

Then item number 12, which relates in somewhat the same way the dean as advisor on morality. "In much of what he does, the Student Personnel Administrator acts as an advisor on morality without being qualified to do so." Here you will notice, we have 25 percent who agree, and 71 percent who disagree. Some of the comments on this particular one I think are a bit interesting. Let me read those for you.

"Who is qualified to act as an advisor on morality?" And 74 people had statements something like this: "Hopefully the dean has some qualifications -- at least as much as others." And 7 said, "Someone must perform this role, and this is the dean's responsibility. The dean is probably better qualified to play this role than are most people. If the dean does not uphold certain standards, he probably is ineffective." And, "The dean should not act as an advisor on morality in much of what he does." "In terms of definitions of morality, and definitions of climate creators, is there a relationship, and does the dean have any responsibility or role in terms of a climate creator, and how is this related to being inadvertently a morality advisor?"

These are some of the comments that have come in on the early part of the questionnaire. I hope that this will give you some thought to take back in further discussions, or even today we would like to hear what you have already found in discussing some of these topics with your colleagues on your own campus as it relates to the perception of the role of the student personnel administrator, where this is a very first approach to a very large and complex problem.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: Thank you, Jack. I might say that we were pleased, in the fairly heavy correspondence that we received as a result of this questionnaire, to learn how many of our NASPA members had taken this question less, I think, as a research activity, but as a stimulus for discussion and proceeded to structure staff meetings or seminars with graduate students on the basis of some of the statements that we had presented in this instrument.

I would like to take the next section of the questionnaire which deals broadly with standards of behavior and social conduct regulations, and focus on the issues that we were trying to raise here, and perhaps react in one or two instances to the kinds of responses which we received.

The first of these questions, question number 15, deals with the purposes of college regulations, and as you will recall from the questionnaire, the statement reads, "Social conduct regulations (e.g. drinking regulations, women's hours, etc.) are essentially devices for maintaining order within the college community rather than expressions of a value system which the institution wishes students to accept."

Clearly, there are at least four kinds of purposes for college regulations. They are: to maintain order within the community; to protect the students in the sense of controlling behavior that impinges on the privacy or threatens the welfare of other people; third, to express a value system which the institution feels others-- for instance, the constituency or Legislature, and so forth -- would wish that the institution promotes; and fourth, to express a value system which the institution adopts and cherishes for its students. We felt that we could lump together purposes one and two, and as an alternative we could lump together purposes three and four. And we felt that a slight majority of our respondents felt that the purpose of college regulations is more than merely the maintenance of order, although a good many comments made it quite clear that when they said that that they meant it is the maintenance of order plus the value system which the institution cherishes for its students.



In a further breakdown of the responses to this questionnaire, where we considered those responses where the title includes somewhere the title "Dean," we find that there is a slightly greater tendency for those in church related institutions to agree with the statement than is the case for those working in non-church related colleges. There is also a slight tendency for those with training or education in law, behavioral science, and higher education to agree more with the statement than for those in natural sciences or education in student personnel work.

There are several ways we might pick up the implications of this first statement in this section. In the first place, it would seem that if we feel that our code of regulations is an expression of a value system, we ought to be quite clear as to the educational assumptions which we are making in the process of defending regulations in this way, and as to our assumptions about the purpose and role of the regulations, for certainly as we defend our regulations to students we need to be clear as to the exact ways in which we assume that they are operative. One would suspect that if the regulations are intended to express a value system we must also constantly be prepared to deal with students with regard to the specific rationale, rather than falling back on some statement of authority, either some theological position which might be reflective of the institution, or some alternative authority. We have to constantly deal, to use Ed Williamson's favorite expression, in seminar fashion or dialogue in explaining the regulations.

Question 24 relates, in some sense, to this question in that we suspected that those who felt that college regulations are an expression of a value system might well feel the consensus is not nearly as important in the establishment and/or review of social conduct regulations as is the case for those who feel that your regulations are simply devices for maintaining order. The statement here, you will recall, is that the dominant consideration in the establishment and/or review of social conduct regulations must be the consensus attitudes of faculty and students. Here we found that 57 percent of those who responded to the questionnaire agreed with the statement, whereas only 39 percent disagreed.

The comments that were made in response to this question clearly indicated that those who had some reservations felt that, whereas consensus should be reflected in decisions, it should not be a dominant or controlling factor. And there were further comments that suggested that it is really student attitudes that are important rather than faculty attitudes. Others wished to suggest

that we involve also the community, our society and parents as other elements that are important in determining consensus in support of college regulations.

One might well ask in looking at this particular issue, what techniques for consensus seeking are particularly appropriate; and consequently, it would seem that those of us in student personnel administration must establish devices for taking soundings, vis-a-vis regulations and determining consensus. I cannot resist parenthetically suggesting that demonstrations and things of this kind are more apt to reflect the wishes of an articulate minority rather than the consensus of the majority. There are a number of issues that relate to the response to a demonstration, but one that I would like to toss out for the moment is the question of what kind of behavior is being reinforced on the basis of our response to the demonstration or the sit-in? I am struck by the difference between the Berkeley situation a year ago and the situation in Chicago during this past year, where, you will recall, at the University of Chicago they said, if I have the facts correct from long distance, that we will not listen to you while you are sitting in now. We have regular channels established for this, and when you leave the building and proceed to use the regular channels we have much to talk about, and we would like very much to proceed with the business of discussion.

One would guess that the kind of behavior being reinforced by that response was much more constructive than the behavior being reinforced by the response to the Berkeley demonstration a year earlier.

There are three other questions that hang together and relate to this general area of concern, having to do with whether or not the dean has a responsibility, one, to uphold unspecified standards of behavior; two, to influence students in the development of their value system; and three, to protect students from defeating experiences. We ought to put the protect in quotation marks. These are questions number 7, 25 and 16.

Question number 7 says, "While behaviors which might result in suspension should be specified, the Student Personnel Administrator is responsible for upholding certain standards (especially in the area of sexual behavior) which because of their nature cannot be stated in a specific code of regulations." There are two issues raised in this question, and it is impossible to tell from the results which issue was really being responded to. On the one hand, we are asking to what extent is the Student Personnel Administrator responsible for defining and upholding standards? On the

other hand, we are asking to what extent must regulations be specified in advance and in writing in order to serve as a basis for disciplinary action?

As you will see from Table I, 76 percent of those who responded to the questionnaire agreed with the statement, whereas 21 percent disagreed. A further analysis of those who hold the title of "Dean," indicates that there is a slight tendency for those in church related institutions to agree with the statement more frequently than is the case for those in non-church related institutions.

Question 25, which relates to this, raises three issues in the statement, which reads, "Attempts by student personnel administrators to perform an educational role by influencing students to adopt those values cherished for them by the institution or the dean are questionable behaviors which may actually hinder student growth. Now, it would seem that there are three aspects in this question. One, what is the nature of the educational role of the dean, and is part of it to influence student values? Secondly, if so, what strategies are effective? And thirdly, what are the consequences of such attempts in terms of student growth? Do you actually help student growth, or are you hindering it? Sixty-one percent of our respondents disagreed with the statement. In other words, 61 percent of our respondents felt that this is not questionable behavior but is, in fact, part of the role of the dean of students, whereas, 35 percent of our respondents agreed with the statement.

We found that there was a slight tendency for those in liberal arts and church related colleges to disagree with the statement and, conversely, that new people in the field, those who have been in the field less than two years, have a slightly greater tendency to agree with the statement.

In looking at the results, one implication is most pronounced in my reaction. Namely, it would seem, by the comments that were made, that those who responded negatively or disagreed with the statement had the feeling that the dean is responsible for upholding a particular system of values for the student, rather than saying that the responsibility for the development of a value system in the students is to help them explore alternative value systems and adopt one which is consistent and coherent and serves their need. In other words, I am raising the question as a result of the comments that were submitted as to whether or not we are open, as student personnel people, to the development of adequate systems of values on the part of our students which are different from those which we ourselves hold. We may wish to come back to that because

there are many ways that we could pursue it.

The third question that relates to this general concern is question number 16, which reads: "There is no meaningful success unless the student also has the freedom to fail; thus, student personnel attempts to protect the student from 'defeating experiences' may actually hinder student growth."

You will recognize this as a statement which comes from the Free Speech Movement and the new left, or new breed, as Father Greeley was discussing it this morning. This question, I think, raises three issues. One: What are the essential conditions for student growth? Or what constitutes meaningful opportunity for independent action and growth? Two: What constitutes protecting the students from harmful experiences; and to what extent is this desirable or necessary? And third: What are the consequences of such actions?

As you can see, 68 percent of our respondents agreed with the statement; 54 per cent of them without any reservations. On the other hand, 28 percent of them disagreed. The comments indicated that a large number of you, whereas agreeing with the statement, said, "We don't do this. It is a fine statement but it does not describe our behavior."

I raised the question of whether or not we don't in fact do this. How broad are the options provided for a student in our institution? Do we, on occasion, indiscriminately intercede for him when he is on the verge of failure? I can think of one immediate example in my own experience of a student who had lived his life really ducking failure and ducking risk-taking in order to minimize the risks of failure. It was not until he was finally told that he could not continue in the institution without a period of rest and relaxation, or some other activity, outside our walls that in our interaction, one with another, he really seemed to be ready to put himself on the line and risk it.

Each of us, I think, has experiences like this that raise the question that is being raised in this particular statement. One might state the case for agreement with this statement as follows: A freedom of inquiry is essential to education. This is a statement to which we all subscribe. We might further paraphrase Immanuel Kant and say thought without action is empty, and action without thought is blind. Consider, therefore, the restrictions on freedom of action which may force students to a separation of his actions from his thoughts, which in one way or another hinder growth, violates integrity, and makes his educational experience truncated and shallow.

If we deny him the opportunity off campus or on to act on the basis of his convictions, it seems to me we have to seriously consider whether or not we are not hindering his growth and violating his integrity. The necessity of limits is obvious, but I think the logical extension of his line of argument reinforces the notion that our rules and regulations are perhaps drawn primarily in order to maintain order and protect the welfare of others within the academic community.

Now, in the absence of Jerry Godard, who had planned to be with us until he was unable to at the last minute, let me deal, while I am on my feet, with two other questions which relate quite directly to those that I have been discussing and which are reported in Table I, under the second section. These are questions number 8 and 19 which deal with the enforcement of regulations. I would like to read the statements to you.

Question 8 says, "The excusing of a student in emotional difficulty from a university standard or requirement is likely to constitute the reinforcement of unacceptable behavior."

Question number 19, on the other hand, reads as follows: "Exceptions to standardized policies, procedures, and regulations, in response to concern for the individual student are likely in the long run to constitute a disservice to the student in terms of his adequately understanding the consequences of adult deviation from established norms."

Now, the common theme in both, of course, is a consideration of the consequences of making exceptions to policies and regulations. The differences in the two statements hinge on the fact that in question 8 we are talking about exceptions based on emotional difficulties which the student has, and in question number 19 the emphasis is on exceptions made in the interests of individual attention or personalization, and the emphasis is also on long-range consequences.

We find that in response to question number 8, 52 percent of our respondents disagreed, 35 percent of them without reservation, whereas only 45 percent agree. In other words, most of our respondents would make exceptions on the basis of emotional difficulty. In response to question number 19, 61 percent disagree, 47 percent of these without reservation; whereas, only 35 percent agree.

Whereas, I would not argue that we should not make exceptions to policy, let me state the case for at least considering long-range consequences and in considering the implications of these statements

as we do so. Let me do it in terms of some examples, to begin with.

I know of one situation, for example, where 16 freshmen had, during the past semester, performance which made them strong candidates for dropping from the college. There was no objective reason for continuing them in the institution. Six of these 16 students had incompletes during that previous semester which, in part, constituted the reason for their being candidates for drop out. In each case these were based on "emotional difficulties." Earlier in the year, all six of these students had been excused and granted incompletes for similar reason. Now, the question, of course, is whether or not their behavior had been reinforced and increased the likelihood of their doing the same thing in the future.

Consider a second kind of partially objective, partially subjective evidence, which I am willing to offer for discussion; namely, my experience when I was working in a graduate school, examining the records of undergraduate students, and again examining the records of these people after they had been in graduate school for a year or two. Although I do not have the actual correlation of statistics now, I can report with considerable confidence that there was a strong correlation between the presence of incompletes on the record during undergraduate years and the presence of incompletes on the record during graduate school.

We can all, I think, call upon our own experiences and think of individuals who exhibit later on in their graduate years, and later on in undergraduate years, behaviors which began to appear in more modest form during the early years in college, and we made notes of it and records, and took no action, and found that not taking action on the basis of this would appear in part to have led to reinforcement of that behavior.

I cannot refrain from commenting that to some extent the case for agreement with these statements, insofar as one considers psychological evidence, and we have not offered any hard evidence here quite clearly, reinforces the wisdom that the old guard deans -- put that in quotation marks -- seem to have in their method of handling certain kinds of violations of policy; and one would wonder (at least I would) whether or not we ought to re-examine what we do in the interest of personalizing our concern for students, and in the interests of our concern for those who evidence some kinds of difficulty.

Now, let us move into another section where

we talk about the student and the institution, before we stop for questions.

DEAN THOMAS B. DUTTON (Dean of Students, Oakland University): As Pete indicated, the third section of the study dealt with the deans perception of the relationship of the student to the institution. More specifically, items were included to appraise the deans' feelings concerning student freedoms and institutional control, concepts and conditions under which student development might be maximized, and student involvement in the decision making process. These items were included since they represented areas of concern to deans and the total academic community. In view of the increased rebellion of students against institutional authority and the rapid growth in size and complexity of colleges and universities as well as other factors which have caused a re-examination of the fundamental relationship of the student to the institution, it seemed vital that the questionnaire contain items designed to assess the assumptions and beliefs of deans regarding the student and institutional relations.

#### ITEM FOUR

Item 4 dealt with the question of institutional or external direction versus self or internal direction in student development. The item was phrased as follows: "If left uninfluenced and unrestrained students would grow toward goodness."

There has been considerable discussion of late about institutional control and self direction in learning. Harold Taylor has written, "People become better when freed from authority, when they make their own choices and think for themselves, and when they act out of personal judgment." On the other hand, Charles Frankel has stated that, "learning is a hierarchical affair," and that students are not full citizens of the learned community. In his view, they are apprentices of the academic guild and they are in the institution to be influenced and directed in their development.

These are just two views among many regarding the role of the institution and the student in learning, and we thought it would be of interest and value to determine how the deans viewed this issue.

Of the 490 deans who responded to this item, 34.5 percent agreed with the statement and 65.5 percent disagreed. Clearly the largest portion of the deans felt that external influence and restraint were necessary in the learning process. This conclusion is



strengthened when the agreed with reservations category is examined in greater depth. The respondents in this category (24.5 percent) felt that not all individuals could grow without direction and that some guidance was necessary in the academic community. Accordingly, about 90 percent of the respondents felt that external influence of some type was a prerequisite to educational development. It is not surprising that this type of response was received. Our institutions have been built on and operate under the principle that learning, to some degree, is an externally stimulated process. The fundamental question, of course, is how much external influence should be exercised.

#### ITEMS 20 AND 22

I will deal with the next two items together, and they are: (1) "Within the context of the obvious individual differences in student ability and maturity, it is more desirable to err in the direction of over-delegation of responsibility to students than in the direction of under-delegation." (2) "The student must be viewed as an individual who is most likely to attain maturity if left free to make personal decisions and to exercise the rights as well as shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship on and off the campus."

These two items are related to the amount of freedom that should be given to students in the educational process and the conditions of optimal student growth. In examining the responses on both items, we find that 84 percent of the deans on item 20 and 88 percent on item 22 favored the statements; that is, they supported the idea of error in the direction of over delegation of authority and the granting of freedom to students to make personal decisions. On the personal freedom item, 22 percent of the respondents fell into the agreed with reservations category, and they felt that students should be free to make personal decisions but within the standards of the institution and that the amount of freedom granted should be related to personal maturity.

The fact that the deans were willing to support over-delegation of authority and the student freedom to make personal decisions does not indicate an inconsistency with their response on item 4 where we found that a high percentage of the deans held the belief that influence and restraint were important in the educational experience. I would speculate that the deans favored delegation of authority and the granting of freedom to make personal judgments within the context of institutional objectives, standards and limitations.



## ITEM 9

This item was designed to secure beliefs concerning the limitation or lack of limitation of student freedoms that membership in the academic community imposes. The statement was, "Student membership in the academic community imposes no special limitations on his citizenship freedoms." This item seemed particularly relevant in light of the student stated cause of the Berkeley demonstrations in 1964 and the pronouncements of the American Civil Liberties Union and the AAUP. The American Civil Liberties Union and the AAUP hold the view that students should not be shackled by institutional control of their off campus life; that students should have the same freedoms and rights as citizens; and that a clear distinction should be made between community and institutional interest. On the other hand, it is common practice in higher education for an institution to limit student behavior in ways which would not be true of the general population (i.e., rules related to closing hours, where students may live, their activities in the residence halls, etc.). Frankel has stated that "The colleges' obligation to the student, where approached from the family point of view (in loco parentis), is an obligation to an individual enjoying special protection; and insofar as this protection is to be effective, the student cannot have all of the rights of the free and unprotected adult."

What is the position of college deans concerning student citizenship freedoms?

On this item we found both considerable agreement and disagreement. A substantial number of the deans, 59 percent, expressed the belief that institutional expectations should not conflict with the student's citizenship freedoms, but also a sizeable number of deans, 41 percent, felt that the academic community has the right to impose special obligations as a condition of admission. The amount of disagreement on this issue may in fact be greater in light of the open ended comments of the deans in the agreed with reservations category. A large number of the deans indicated that the student assumed more responsibility when he joined the academic community and that the institution has the right to impose special obligations on students.

It must be pointed out, however, that division in belief among the deans may be related, in part, to uncertainty over the meaning of citizenship freedoms. It may be that many deans interpreted citizenship freedoms to mean the basic freedoms of petition, speed, and press, etc., whereas, others may have taken

the broader view of citizenship freedoms related to freedom to come and go as one pleased, to live where one desires, and so on.

#### ITEMS 10 AND 18

The last two items on which I will comment are related to student involvement in decision making. These comments are: (1) "The major justification for significant student involvement in college policy decisions is to maximize the probability of insightful decisions rather than to educate the student for leadership or to give him a feeling of identity in the academic community." (2) "There are no areas of college policy or decision making to which students necessarily cannot make significant contributions."

Today, students are demanding a greater role in decision making, and we are being chided by faculty, administrators, and others to find ways of involving students more meaningfully in the determination of policy. At the October meeting of the American Council on Education, many speakers commented on the importance of greater student participation in the administration of the institution in the coming years, and we were told that the time was right and ripe to allow students a stronger contributing role in the shaping of educational policy. Recently, California newspapers carried stories about the election of the new student body president at Stanford who was allied with the new student left and about his proposal for a one scholar, one vote government for Stanford. He advocated a board of trustees elected by the faculty and students and an all powerful university legislature in which students, faculty and administrators would meet as equals.

In view of the pressures for greater and more effective student involvement it seemed appropriate to attempt to discover how the deans felt about student participation.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement that the primary justification for student involvement is to maximize the formulation of insightful decisions. I can only speculate as to the meaning of this response, but I would suggest that it indicates that all of the reasons for student involvement which are contained in the item are considered to be important justification for student participation. Support for this conclusion can be found in the open ended comments in the agreed with reservations category. A large number of the respondents in this category felt that all of the objectives mentioned were equally important. Otherwise, insightful decisions, leadership development and community

identification were all important outcomes of student participation.

Fifty-six percent of the respondents felt that students could make contributions in all areas whereas 44 percent disagreed with this position. Fourteen percent of the deans agreed with reservations, and their comments can be summarized as follows: Student contribution may be limited due to lack of experience, and there are some areas (for example, finance and hiring) in which students should not be involved. In view of these comments it would seem that the magnitude of disagreement on the item was greater than the 44 percent figure indicates.

It is significant that the deans were about evenly divided on this issue. What is the reason for this? It may be that the figures suggest a clear and real division among the deans; that is, that half of the deans felt that students could contribute in all areas regardless of the complexity and nature of the problems involved whereas fifty percent held the position that there were definite limitations on student involvement.

I suspect that an important factor in understanding this response may be how the words "significant contributions" were defined by the deans and how the deans viewed the process of contribution to policy making. It is conceivable that some deans felt that student editorials, petitions and other ways of expressing concern about problems would constitute a significant contribution, and thusly, they may have agreed with the statement. Other deans may have viewed student involvement more formally, i.e., sitting on committees and participating actively with faculty and administrators in policy making, and they might have felt that this was not appropriate in all areas. Therefore, they did not support the statement.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the deans in general favored the position that institutional influence, restraint and guidance were necessary in learning, but that students should be free to make personal decisions and to function within limits consistent with the educational objectives of the institution. They did not favor a highly restrictive environment, and they were willing to delegate responsibility to students.

There was considerable disagreement on the item dealing with limitation on citizenship freedoms and on the statement relative to the areas of student contribution in policy making. Both of these results

might have been a function of the structure of the items and the varying interpretation of the words used in the statements. The largest share of the deans rejected the statement that the primary justification for student involvement in the operation of the institution is to maximize insightful decisions.

I would like to conclude with a series of questions which the study suggested to me. I feel that our research has raised more questions than it has produced clear answers and ideas.

1. If we assume that influence and restraint are necessary in the educational enterprise, how much control and how much freedom are required to maximize student development? Do we attempt to influence and restrain to an undesirable degree? Since we seem to favor institutional control, do we communicate to students and faculty an over-concern with external direction? How can we effectively blend external and internal direction in the learning process?

2. What is the significance of the nearly 50-50 split on the item related to the limitation of citizenship freedoms. If it is true that nearly half of the deans favor limitations, does this reflect an inadequate understanding of individual rights and does it communicate to others a commitment to an authoritative and restrictive point of view? Is this a source of conflict with students and liberal elements of the academic community? Is this one of the reasons why we are viewed as controllers or limiters of freedom rather than supporters and protectors of students rights? What should be our position regarding student citizenship freedoms? Is it necessary that there be conflict between student citizenship freedoms and his responsibilities and expectation as a member of the academic community?

3. The study indicated that we supported the idea of over-delegation and the view that students should be free to make personal decision. Are these conclusions consistent with actual practice? To what extent are we really willing to let students fail and experiment and to exercise personal judgment?

4. What are the justifications for student involvement in policy determination? Why do we invite students to participate? Do we initiate participation or are we forced into it? Do we see student involvement as a necessary evil or as a means of making better decisions, educating students and increasing community identification? Do we have a clear understanding of how, where, and when students should participate? Does our failure to clearly understand the bases and reasons

for student involvement and our lack of foresight in initiating student participation, result in militant and negative student efforts to influence institutional decision making?

DR. PHILLIP A. TRIPP (Research Specialist, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.): I think I have only been in one worse time slot in the recent past than this. You have been listening to people talk all day, and Leo is shaking his hands a little bit -- he is getting tired -- and I see a few droopy eyelids, and a yawn or two. How shall I attract your interest and attention for the few minutes that remain to me? I think perhaps to capsulize what we have been trying to do would be a useful opener, at least to remind you that this series of detailed pieces of information we have been giving you derive from a kind of taxonomy of student personnel administration, if you will. We self-consciously laid out some tentative parameters we thought might encompass the field.

As you see, in this report we have grouped questions under these headings. One of the most useful things you can help to do for us, to help us deal with our task, is to consider this taxonomy and tell us if we have left out important ideas and important parameters that need to be pressed as we use this instrument and develop it further to achieve the end we started out to achieve.

I was assigned the topic of the administrative style of the dean to tell you a little about. I do not know that we are self-conscious about the notion of having styles, but certainly when one stops and examines his behavior and the general character of his responses to situations, the bases upon which he moves in arriving at decisions, these are perfectly clear. It has been a rather remarkable experience on this panel, on this advisory board, to see how administrative styles are different among the five or six of us who are on this board, and how our perceptions of problems differ in substantial ways. We have had a lot of fun in this sort of activity, and I think we have opened the door for some substantive inquiries that can have long run significance for our professional work.

I proposed one of the questions that I am going to talk about now, and we have grouped four questions under the question of the dean's integrity and his response to situations. One thing that has been of major interest to me as a person who is deeply interested in the professionalization of this work is the extent and degree to which the dean has to be the president's boy.

You remember that question? Question number two on the survey or the instrument says: "The Dean's responsibilities to his President should consistently take precedence over his personal convictions." 355 respondents said, "Yes," and 151 said, "No." There was strong feeling on that one. How much are we professionals who have the same prerogative as any professor to exercise professional judgment on the issues that come to us? And to what extent and degree are we the errand boys of the president?

I guess I reveal a bias in that statement, don't I? Sixty-five answers, specialized comments, were categorized under these two rubrics: "The dean should resign if he cannot support his president." The other: "Agreed, but frequent disagreement should lead to a parting of the ways." "Maybe yes, and maybe no."

One hundred fifty-four fell into this set of statements: "Differences of opinion are constructive." Pretty good ego strength reflected there, but there are only nine of those. "The dean must be free to express his convictions to the president in an attempt to influence his opinions on behavior, but finally comply with his decision." A lot of people said that: 87.

Sixty-seven said, "The dean should never sacrifice his principles or welfare of the school and students."

And we had 24 gandy dancers who said, "It depends on the circumstances. The dean must use his common sense."

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: They are the old pros.

DR. TRIPP: They are the old pros. (Laughter)

I think it is kind of interesting to speculate on the implications of these statements.

The second statement that fell into this category was number 17, which says, "The worst possible basis for action by a student personnel administrator is expediency or administrative convenience." We had several varieties of answers on that -- most of them noble.

Thirty-two people said, "I agree with reservations. Occasionally a student personnel administrator must act on the basis of expediency. These are the facts of life."

Nine said, "It depends on the circumstances." Gandy dancers.

Three more kind of salved their conscience by saying, "Expediency may not conflict with student interests."

I am reminded of the George Bernard Shaw story about the proposition he made to a woman one time. He said, would she go to bed with him for 1,000 pounds. She said, "Of course." He said, "Will you go to bed with me for five?" She said, "What do you think I am, a prostitute?" He said, "That has already been determined and we are now arguing about price." (Laughter)

Twenty-one was the fourth question in this set: "Direct and open conflict with students on an issue on which the Student Personnel Administrator disagrees with the consensus student position should be avoided since it may jeopardize his rapport with students." We got good ego strength on this. One hundred said, "Yes," but 406 said, "No; disagree." And they had rather strong opinions about it.

Sixty-two deans said, "It is the dean's responsibility to state his conviction." I wanted to do an item analysis to see if these are the same men who on the second question held strong opinions about their relationship to the president; but this kind of analysis is kind of tricky with the limited funds we have.

Thirty-five said, "Disagree. Opinions should be voiced. It will enhance respect for the dean of students."

We had quite a spread of opinion beyond that in smaller units. Twenty-five said, "Depends on the situation and the issue." Of course, they are being pragmatic and sensible and I should not quip about people who so responded.

The last one in this category was question number 26. "In the interests of enabling students to feel that they have a 'friend in court,' it is important for the Student Personnel Administrator to disassociate himself from unpopular decisions made by the President, Business Manager or Academic Dean."

Forty-two persons said, "The student personnel administrator should stand on what he feels personally is right. Forty-seven who commented said, "A certain amount of consensus among administration, and loyalty to the school is necessary." But I think it is quite clear that we have enough ego strength in our offices to stand up against unpopular opinion when and if the issue is of such magnitude, in our judgments.

These little tests of our thought, of our relationship and our responsibility to our administrative superiors, and to our tyros, I think are kind of interesting little tests of what we think we are doing in our work. I suppose I should not be surprised by a wide spread of opinion. We are a wide spread of people. We come from all kinds of backgrounds and all kinds of perceptions of this work. Inevitably we will have a wide disparity of views. I would hope that this would be the substance of our professional discourse though, that we treat these topics which I think are of enormous significance, in our councils, such as this meeting, and in our journals, and in our thinking and research, whenever possible.

The last group was a small one. It only had two items in it. That had to do with the dean as a possible contributor to the terrible reality of depersonalization. We had two questions in that category, question 13 and question 27. Question 13 is as follows: "An essential ingredient for personalization in higher education is provision for the personal privacy of the individual student and avoidance of invasions of this privacy in the name of administration of regulations."

We have pretty strong consensus on that: 372 respondents said "Yes," and 126 said, "No." The "No" respondents are of interest to me. These constitute a substantial minority and have a right to their opinions. They say, "We must provide a reasonable degree of privacy, but that is not an exhaustive statement." Almost 50 said, "Violation of regulations justify invasion of privacy in matters of health, safety, common good, and so on." These are pragmatic people who are trying to give honest answers. I think we can take some satisfaction in agreeing among ourselves on the necessity for protecting students' rights to privacy in a time and circumstance when this is a rarer and rarer commodity.

The last question, question 27, says: "A significant aspect of depersonalization in higher education is the tendency in Student Personnel Administration to react to growth in the student population by inserting still more 'professional staff' between the student and the top policy-making, position-taking administrators of the college or university." This is more an opinion question. I guess it does have philosophical import. Three hundred and nine respondents said they agreed to some extent; 182 said they did not think this was significant. Thirty-three observed that more people does not necessarily mean depersonalization. I am sure they are responding by a rationalization to the question, that in the sense that if we



have more people we have more staff to perform the functions we have always performed. Twenty-two said, "It is part of growth, specialization, expansion of institutions, and it cannot be avoided, so kismet." Thirty-four said, "It depends on the nature and functions of the intermediates. They do not necessarily close channels." I think that is an astute observation, but it is a challenge to us to produce this kind of staff person who helps us understand students and who, at the same time, understands students.

Well, we had a lot of fun with this. I am going to let Pete wrap it up. I am afraid I am discouraged by the disparity of views among us, but I know this is how the world is. I hope we can use these kind of terms to build our professional understandings.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: Well, that wraps up the talks from this end of the room. I think I should apologize for deliberately raising so many questions and leaving you with a frustration of very little time to get back at us. As we said at the outset, we think we have done a significant portion of our job if we can begin discussion of some of these issues, both here at this Conference and throughout councils of student personnel administrators in years to come.

Where would you like to begin in getting back at us, or picking up the discussion that we have tried to initiate?

DEAN CLIFFORD L. ROGERS (St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa): I have not had a chance to digest this survey in connection with the AAC statement last night. I was curious whether those of you who have had a chance to digest those two have found whether there might be a high correlation between those things on this survey, in which there was a high agreement, and the statements that were prepared and presented last night. In other words, did the statements of last night indicate pretty well what we found out from this survey?

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: I guess I am going to have to give you a "seat of the pants" response, Cliff, because we have not really analyzed it in quite that way. It is quite true that, I think, seven of the questions were put in there explicitly because we were aware of the discussions that were going to take place between these various associations, and we wanted to see how deans responded to some of the assumptions that seemed to be basic to the AAUP position. I have not really analyzed them in quite the way that you are suggesting, although I would hazard the guess that the

position reflected in the AAC statement, which you looked at last night, is consistent with the consensus opinion, or at least the majority opinion as reflected in this questionnaire that we have been looking at. I may stand corrected after we have really looked at it in this fashion, but I don't think so.

DEAN WILLIAM A. YARDLEY (University of Houston, Houston, Texas): I was interested in this question and your response. At first blush, I would say just the opposite.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: At which point?

DEAN YARDLEY: Just as a generalization. The statistics that this reveals do not support the basic positions reflected in the statement, the AAC statement.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: I don't know how we can resolve this, except going back statement by statement. My reaction when I first looked at this was more in line with discrepancies between what we had supposed typical dean behavior to be, on the one hand, and the assumptions of deans as reflected in the response here, on the other, than it was really surprise at these statements.

DEAN YARDLEY: To put labels on it, the AAC statement might be termed more liberal. There is more of a conservative reflection here than a liberal one.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: All right, let me clarify my initial response. You defined the AAC response as liberal, and perhaps it is. In comparison with the AAUP statement it is not liberal; it is conservative. I think these are in the conservative category, and that is why I said it is consistent with the AAC document. The deviations between AAC and AAUP reflect the differences suggested by these documents.

DEAN YARDLEY: You say AAC is conservative in relation to AAUP?

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: Yes.

DEAN YARDLEY: As it stands by itself (forget the comparative), how would you clarify the AAC statement without reference to the other?

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: With regard to what we have talked about in the practice of student personnel it is liberal, certainly. There is one thing which I commented on last night -- for those of you who were not there last night but are here this afternoon -- the last two statements we have not commented on today, but we remarked last night that many people are concerned with due process, more out of concern for staying

out of courts than what might be more appropriate a motivation. We were quite pleased really with the response to this questionnaire which indicated that a very sizeable percentage of our membership, who felt that the procedure of due process was a respect for students' rights on the one hand, were in agreement on the view that there was a possibility that those with authority might sometimes abuse it, which makes it absolutely essential to provide procedural safeguards. If this is what we believe, we have positive motivation to make sure we have the necessary procedural safeguards.

DEAN CHANNING M. BRIGGS (Portland State College, Portland, Oregon): I am wondering if you deliberately placed in some ambiguity, particularly into the philosophical stance questions. Could I get an answer from one or more of the panel members on that?

DR. TRIPP: I think many of these statements are loaded, obviously. We had lots of curves in there and we are interested in how they would be fielded.

DEAN BRIGGS: Ambiguity was the question.

DR. TRIPP: I do not think we consciously tried to make them ambiguous.

DEAN BRIGGS: I see a contrast between the questions you talked about and the conclusions, which are behavioral in context, and those that are imprecise, built upon generalizations, built upon good guesses and so on, which make it very difficult to come up with even a beginning profile on reaction. Frankly, you did not get my questionnaire because after the first ten questions I said, look, I don't know what they are after. It may be ambiguity, it may be something else, but I am not going to answer it. And I am sorry, I would have liked to have been a proper contributor here, but the ambiguity just overcome any validity that I could somehow see, and this bothered me.

DR. TRIPP: I think the thing we can presume is that we had hoped for a visceral response. We did not want elaborate cerebral responses because this kind of material does not lend itself to that without all kinds of qualifications. How do you perceive these things as a professional person, quickly and without detailed analysis? It is impossible to have a detailed analysis, obviously. In your case, you are a thoughtful man who insists on detailing the facts as you go along, and it wouldn't work in your case.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: Let me add a footnote.

You will note that one of our beginning assumptions that we have tried to explain elsewhere was that many times we are in situations for which we do not have ready made responses and we fall back on certain assumptions, and what we are really trying to do is identify some of these assumptions and get some of the immediate reactions in response to situations which might reflect the feelings. We are groping now. This is an exploratory investigation.

DR. TRIPP: You think we could go at this cerebrally?

DEAN BRIGGS: I would hope so.

DEAN ROBERT J. DOLLAR (Arlington State College, University of Texas System, Arlington, Texas): You directed some remarks at the interest shown by some responses in the situational factor. In other words, people kept saying to you, "Some of this is situational." Perhaps this is a variable that you should tie in as you go further, because this is what has been revealed in research on secondary and elementary administrators, that situational factors are important.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: Yes.

DR. TRIPP: We had hoped to extract a body of questions that were not excessively dependent on situational responses, that rested on some adoptions of premises. Maybe we did not succeed.

DEAN O. W. LACY (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania): To follow up his line of thought, it might be wise to go back through and see how many questions were heavily saturated with these "It depends on the situation" quibble; because this is the nature of our life.

DR. TRIPP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: Well, right from the start, we have assumed that a critical incidence approach to many of these issues is the best way at getting at meaningful data.

REV. P. H. RATTERMAN (Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio): I found the thing rather interesting and fun to answer because I don't think I agreed or disagreed anywhere. Every question, with me, was with reservations. I thought it was kind of fun. Did you plan it this way or did I just happen to be this kind of a guy?

DR. TRIPP: Don't you think the spread of answers answers your question, Father Ratterman?

REV. RATTERMAN: Yes. Then, my next question is this. Is this significant of the spread? It is rather interesting to note that on some of these you got the great bulk in the middle, where 121 agree with reservations, or 120 disagree with reservations. Is that significant at all on that type of question? I cannot figure out what it would mean. The trend is toward the middle on that. Does that mean it was a real good question, or a bad question?

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: We recognize it as a significant issue, and we have not made up our mind. It must puts it on the agenda for discussion right now.

REV. RATTERMAN: Yes, that is probably it.

DEAN YARDLEY: Bill, you were reflecting on question two, in this business of the relationship with the president. I think perhaps there is a factor involved in that one, as well as with some others -- at least it was with me -- in the sense that the president is theoretically a symbol of the total community and so, at its best, when you talk about one's relationship with the president, theoretically you are talking about your relationship to the total institution of which, hopefully, you play a part. So in question two, you could kind of substitute "responsibilities to the university"; and if it is put in that context I think it is a little more euphemistic. Here you are pitting one individual against another; whereas, if you are pitting the individual, the dean, in his relationships with the total university, that is another thing. He is a part of it. Unless he thinks he is going to take it over, presumably he attempts to persuade, and if things become so grim that it is intolerable, he gets out.

DR. TRIPP: This is a varitable thicket of thorny ones. We deliberately did this pitting job because it is a kind of issue that has a good deal to do with our professional status. Are we in the same relationship to the president of a college or university as the executive officer on a ship is to a commanding officer? Or are we a different breed of professional person who has special competencies, maybe analogous to a professor of mathematics with whom the president won't argue on matters of substance in mathematics. This is a continuum that we have to examine. That would be an easy out, I think: the dean against the university. I think you have a different kind of answer there. I think most of us come from a tradition: line and staff. We have been hired by the

president to be his alter ego in a certain area, and this is a perfectly legitimate view of student personnel administrators.

DEAN YARDLEY: The university is symbolic.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: But it boils down to the same question. If your interpretation of your responsibility to the institution is different from the president's interpretation, you are back with the same issue that we raised in the statement, are you not?

DEAN BRIGGS: The president gives me hell if I disagree with him basically and don't let him know it. I think this is very important. I am not on a par in a decision making status, but I am asked to supply him with the data. I press for consideration. I may lose, but he has a higher rung on the decision making ladder than I do. I don't think this is the real question. It seems to me we are alluding to conformity while we really ought to be talking about our participation in decision making, and they are quite different issues, as far as I see it.

DR. TRIPP: I look on this as a question of not a conformity, but our status in the decision making phenomenon. Are we experts or are we advisors with some special competencies, but who are not really competent in the sense that a professor of mathematics is competent to treat a subject?

DEAN BRIGGS: But you are confusing the two realms of discourse here. Franklin Roosevelt, to use a corny expression, was not a specialist in anything. He had a lot of specialists in his cabinet around about him; but he made the decisions, and it was not a question of teaching mathematics, or psychology, or anything else. It was a question of "How I think this institution (namely the country) ought to move." I think the analogy here of the professor and the president breaks down.

DR. TRIPP: I am suggesting that the status of the student personnel administrator is different from other administrators in the institution in that he does potentially have substantive competencies that give him professorial prerogatives not inconsistent with an academic dean.

DEAN BRIGGS: He may teach, in which case he has the freedom of the right of teaching, and the president can disagree with him all he wants to, and the dean of students who is a teacher has the AUP behind him; but as an administrator, it seems to me he is absolutely responsible to the administrative organization of the institution, usually exemplified by the

president.

CHAIRMAN ARMACOST: On that note, and looking at our watches, we will say "No" to any further questions and wrap up this session.

Let me say that our experience this year in discussing these issues before putting them in the questionnaire has been the most valuable seminar that I have participated in for four long weekends. It has contributed, I hope, to my professional development, and we hope the work of this division can have the same affect on other people in the profession. We are sorry that Mark Smith and Jerry Godard, the other two people of the division, are unable to be with us. I know you are sorry too, if you know these two people and their perceptive comments.

We stand adjourned.

... The seminar adjourned at five o'clock ...

---

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION  
BUSINESS MEETING  
Tuesday - June 28, 1966

The fourth general session and business meeting convened at nine o'clock, President Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Hunter College (Bronx), presiding.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Ladies and Gentlemen, the program says that we get under way at nine o'clock, and unless Miriam Sheldon objects, we are going to start at nine o'clock. Does your watch say nine o'clock?

DEAN SHELDEN: It does.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: I now call the Fourth General Session of NASPA to order, and just in time comes Carl Knox.

We have a long agenda. We are going to try to do it as expeditiously as possible. People will be coming in, nonetheless, we will have adequate time for discussion at any point which interests you.

The order of business is printed on page 27 of your Conference Program. I now call for the report of the Conference Chairman, Thomas Emmet.

DEAN THOMAS A. EMMET (Report of Conference Chairman): We have at this Conference officially registered to date 426 persons, 117 wives appear to be the correct number, and we are having a little trouble counting children since we do not register them formally, but our estimates show there are about 97 children in attendance that are visible, at any rate.

The Executive Committee, as you know, had determined that we would meet in Cincinnati, Ohio, next year, 1967. In 1968 our 50th Anniversary Conference will be in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In 1969, in Atlanta, Georgia. The hotels and such for these are listed in the Conference program.

The 1969 meeting will be a meeting with the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. Just in brief, for the record, this is how this is tentatively going to work. They will have their regular meeting, and we will have our regular meeting, but on the last day of their meeting, and the first day of our meeting we will have joint meetings. How this is going to work logistically will begin to be planned in June, or at least during the summer.

The Executive Committee at its meeting the other day approved the 1970, 1971, and 1972 Conference



locations, and in the next few weeks we will be working out the final hotel arrangements.

The 1970 Conference, which was seriously contested by many cities on the East Coast, will go to the City of Boston, with a number of the schools in that area being the host schools.

The 1971 Conference will go to St. Louis, Missouri.

The 1972 Conference will go to Denver, Colorado.

We have tried to work out a pattern in which we will be meeting East, Midwest, and then in the South, or Southwest, or Rockies, one of those alternates in the third year, and then repeat the cycle, with approximately every ten years on the West Coast.

That concludes my report, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Mr. Conference Chairman. Are there any comments or questions from the floor?

There being none, I now call on the Editor of the NASPA Journal, and our Director of Publications, Dean Richard Siggelkow.

DEAN RICHARD SIGGELKOW (Report of Editor of NASPA Journal): I have a very brief report. We are now beginning Volume 4, and the theme, if you have not seen it yet, is going to be on financial aids. As you know, we always try to keep the themes timely, and we always have some copy in advance, with the idea that we may want to make some change if we get some exciting topic to use.

We have some other themes coming up in which you may be interested. We will have a rather informative issue on certain aspects of administration, with possible articles from Earl Koil, Samuel Gould of the State University of New York, and our own Armour Blackburn.

Another future issue will include some articles by students and include articles from people such as Mr. Philip Sherburne, whom you met here our first evening. The timely topic of the Junior College will be covered in the near future, and we have in preparation, under the direction of Van Putnam, a theme on foreign students. Hal Ricker is working on one on Housing, and Max Andrews has promised one on the Union area.

Basically we hope that two major purposes are being met. It has been serving as an educational tool for you and it has been serving as a training vehicle, if you will, and we are very pleased to have people who voluntarily let us know this. I cannot help but say this. Professors Melvene Hardee, Esther Lloyd-Jones, and Kate Mueller all wrote to us and said they used this Journal in their classroom teaching, and we felt that was a high compliment for us indeed.

We have been asked permission to use the articles in part or in their entirety for several books, which have appeared originally in the Journal, and that also encourages us a great deal.

The other major primary aim is to encourage new writing. We will work on your manuscript for you. The Board has to either accept or reject, as you probably know. The name of the author is omitted, and you are able to receive their comments as to why it was accepted or why it was rejected. Two members of the three must accept the article.

I do not know whether I should be bragging or complaining, but we have had a number of our articles that have been rejected that have appeared in other Journals later on. (Laughter)

We have one new venture, and before I go into that, I would like to thank the four Board members who are leaving. I will not announce the new Board as yet, but we are adding two women to the Board.

I want to thank our reliable contributors, such as Dean Fred Smith for his "Campus Currents," Ted Miller for "Quotes," Carl Knox, who carries on with the "Breeze," and Bob Morris on "The Point of View."

A new venture is something called "Inservice for Student Personnel." It is by John Truitt and Richard Gross, with a special appendix by Tom Emmet, "A Guide to Programs of Training for College and University Student Services and Personnel Workers." My reason for mentioning this is we will have a limited number of these, over and above the ones the membership received free of charge, for purchase. You may purchase these from Carl Knox or myself, if you will let us know, or any way you want to inform us so that we can get these to you. They are \$1.00 a copy, and there will not be too many of these left in the near future.

Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Are there comments or

questions from the floor? I think we all take great pride in the work of our Editor, and the really astonishing way in which, from its simple beginnings, these publications have begun to have a real impact upon our field and our individual work. Thank you, Dean Siggelkow.

I now call upon -- I cannot call upon him if he is not here. Is Dean Clifford in the room?

VOICE: He is coming shortly.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: I now call upon the Director of the division of Professional Development and Standards, Dean Robert Etheridge.

DEAN ROBERT ETHERIDGE (Report of the Advisory Committee to the Director of Professional Development and Standards): President Glen, I refer your attention to page 38 of the Program, only to point out that one of the members who is on our Advisory Committee to the Director of Professional Development and Standards has been omitted, Herb Brown. He is now with NEA. His name should be listed with the group. I feel that he should receive credit along with those listed.

Dick Siggelkow has mentioned our first bulletin venture, so I need not say more about that, except to express appreciation to John Truitt and hope that you enjoy the bulletin when you get home to receive it.

I think there are two developments within our particular advisory area that are noteworthy.

Our contacts with the COSPA commission on Professional Development have proven over these last three years to be most beneficial and helpful, hopefully, to the Association as well as to the better understanding within the entire student personnel profession. I say the latter for our President's sake. (Laughter)

One of the projects under way within this COSPA commission on Professional Development is perhaps a publication entitled "Guidelines for Establishing Graduate Training Programs for Student Personnel Workers."

Another topic that I believe merits much consideration in these days, and certainly in the days ahead, is the whole area of ethics and standards. We have talked a bit about it in the COSPA commission, and I think it is something we need to be talking more about in terms of our own Association prior to going back in to the COSPA commission for activity there.

One of the things that has been most encour-

ing about the work of a couple of advisory committees that will be reported on later is that they have and will continue to stimulate our particular advisory committee by the kinds of topics that they turn up.

I am thinking here particularly of some of the implications that will come out of the personnel services group, as well as the research and publications group.

We are beginning to sense that within our area we really do not know how it is we evaluate a job; in other words, what kind of a job are we doing, or how well are we doing it. To this end, we are hoping that the Harry McCloskey report on evaluation procedures will soon see the light of day through cooperative efforts with the College Student Personnel Institute, under the direction of John Wittich.

A second development that we see as a result of the close association between the two other advisory committees is the notion of getting together with the training directors, training personnel, in the country to talk about some of the issues that have been turned up as a result of some of the questionnaires that you have received from the Research and Publications Committee.

So, without getting into that area, I think you will begin to see the work that our particular advisory group will be getting into when Earle and Peter report later. Thank you.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Are there any questions or comments directed to Dean Etheridge? There being none, I thank Dean Etheridge for this report on an important aspect of our professional work.

I now call on the Director of the Division of Association Personnel and Services, Dean Earle Clifford.

DEAN EARLE W. CLIFFORD (Report of the Advisory Committee to the Director of Association Personnel and Services): All these papers do not project an extended report.

On page 38 of your program is identified the membership of my rather interesting advisory board for the Division of Association Personnel and Services. There are three members of that board who are here today, and I will mention them because they are here, and let you read the others: Bill Nester, who is Dean of Men at Cincinnati; Roger Nudd, who is Associate Dean of Students, moving from UCLA; and Preston Parr, who is Dean of Student Life at Lehigh. They are attending the Conference and I extend to them my personal appreciation

for really keeping me honest during the year that has just ensued. To Don Hardy and Charles Lewis, who are unable to be here, I extend also in absentia my thanks.

I will try to keep my report brief and highlight what this division was concerned with during the year just completed. I am going to address myself to six, perhaps seven, areas that claimed our attention during the year just passed.

The first thing we attempted to do was to address ourselves to the question of the membership of the Association, and we organized what was really an experimental or pilot effort to promote both institutional and individual membership in the Association. You will hear (if you have not heard) from Carl Knox the results of that effort. There are also some proposals for implementing, we hope, a considerable improvement in that program for the year ahead on the basis of the experience we had this year.

We worked with the vice presidents of the regions in the promotional campaign for membership this year, and we thank them publicly for their assistance with that project and for the results gained and the experience on which we are basing our plans for the future.

The second area that concerned the division was the question of a format that hopefully could be improved for the orientation meeting and for the hospitality extended the new members of the Association. Our concern here was to address ourselves to the question of preserving what has been the fundamental flavor of NASPA meetings in the past, in the face of efforts to increase membership.

Those of you who are new to the Association and experienced our effort this year, we are not satisfied with the results, and the topic will continue to remain on the agenda of the business of this division until we are.

The third area that concerns us, and is always a matter of unfinished business, was the development of a job description for the vice presidents. This was somewhat necessary because of the open ended nature of the description of their jobs in the constitution, because we were attempting to shake down what was, as you know, a year ago a new organizational structure. We hope by the first meeting of the executive committee following this convention to have that job description in detail ready for presentation, and suspect that as a result of it the vice presidents in their regions will become more active and more useful at the so-called grassroots level.

The fourth area that I want to talk about involves the effort we made, perhaps belatedly and perhaps inadequately, but with sincere conviction that it was appropriate and enthusiastic support from the executive committee, the project, in the area of the selective service.

It was our thought that it was important as a service to NASPA for the Association to develop in whatever modest fashion was within the time limits possible, a compilation of the information and the material that might be useful to deans in the operational situation as they designed their own programs for working with students and within their institution, developing procedures for handling the selective service situation.

We were somewhat anticipatory, but not adequately so, with reference to the whole question of the institution's role in cooperating with the draft, or with the selective service system, vis-a-vis cooperating with the student.

We apologize for not being adequately anticipatory of the problems that did develop but did the best we could under the time circumstances. We hope it was helpful. We are certain that what we gave you was authoritative, because we had the endorsement of the selective service system in terms of the procedural statements that were made.

The two items, or I guess three, which are really on the agenda for the future are these. We have been concerned for some time at the opportunity for getting actively involved in the work of the Association in areas that were especially related to interests, and abilities were limited. These opportunities were inadequate and that some system should be developed to adequately mobilize the manpower of the Association.

With the reorganization we adopted a task orientation posture, and the only way to accomplish this is to organize the manpower adequately to implement it.

We have readied a letter which either in August or in September will go to each voting delegate with a postcard asking that the talent of NASPA be identified by the voting delegate and endorsed by him as adequate to participate in the several project areas that claim our attention during the year.

By this program which we are calling "Type, Talent, Identification" project, we hope to mobilize the manpower of the Association and focus it on the tasks that develop during the course of the year, and

and as may be related to the Conference program. As a result, we solicit your cooperation as voting delegates in this project, or with this project, since this will be a short year between conventions and there is much work to be done, and with the activity of the divisions increasing all the time, available manpower is an important item in the equation of success.

The second area that forecasts the future involves the international programming. I am really not the appropriate one to provide any detail on this, because this is Bill Blaesser's special interest and he has had special success with it.

At the present time we are on the threshold of two projects which require only funding; although I use the word "only" I think we can be optimistic regarding the possibility of funding. These involve an international seminar in Indiana, and a study project in Sweden.

We are also talking about the development of a pre-conference seminar, styled after the one that some of you have experienced this year, but in the area of international programming, as a special focus.

These three projects under Bill Blaesser will continue to be pursued, and assuming our optimism regarding the funding is proper, should be ready for general communication before the next national convention.

The final area involves a topic that has been referred to on a variety of occasions during this convention, and has been the prime business of this division for about six weeks, namely, the area of drugs and narcotics. We have invested a considerable amount of energy and time on a project which involves NASPA and three government agencies -- the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Treasury Department, Bureau of Narcotics.

We managed to get the three government agencies together and after a very interesting meeting were able to present to the NASPA executive committee a proposed contract for the financing of an educational program in the area of narcotics and the dangerous drugs, to be mounted immediately after this meeting, once the formal details can be agreed upon and the contract signed.

We insisted that the program refuse to recognize the congressional distinction between narcotics and dangerous drugs, and that is the reason the three agencies got together with us. It was our thinking,

supported generously by the executive committee, that a program in this area could not afford to be invested in and could not be effective unless it covered the full spectrum of problems in this area.

We were somewhat surprised, and exceedingly pleased, to find that the three federal agencies were able to get together and in turn get together with NASPA. We will have a contract, probably signed sometime next week, between NASPA and the Food and Drug administration. The signers are such for simplicity. The Food and Drug Administration will assume the responsibility for coordinating the efforts of the three agencies identified, in programmatic support, as Dr. James Fox of the F.D.A. has referred to it, of this effort, and NASPA will take the leadership in coordinating the active involvement of both NASPA membership and the other associations in the field that have legitimate interest and involvement, and their participation also in the project.

Very briefly, the format of this program will be something of this type. This is a general outline of it at this point. There will be a national meeting sometime in the early fall, attended by about seven NASPA deans, from each of the seven regions. In addition to this group of about fifty, there will be technical pros, identified by the federal agencies and perhaps by the NASPA deans, if they are knowledgeable about resources in their region, and additional representatives from the other associations interested and appropriately or legitimately involved in the program. Also on a regional basis.

Following this national briefing session, the plan is to have this regional team design and implement at the regional level the appropriate follow-up in either a seminar or conference or workshop style, utilizing both the regional and the national technical assistants in developing a program, but essentially attempting to pattern the approach in terms of deans talking with deans, instead of deans listening to the technical pros.

The other major phase of this project will involve a team of three deans, yet to be identified, sitting with a representative of Food and Drug Administration, a science writer, and such other resources as are needed, in some retreat, at least for a week, to take the existing written materials and to convert them into, if you will, our language, so that as an end product of the conferences that occur regionally, each dean will have a handbook which he can use in local follow-up, in inservice training programming on his own campus.



This is the present format -- I suspect probably with some minor adjustment, likely format--of our intent for this coming year in this area.

The executive committee has assigned the housing of the project in terms of the office of a national director and secretarial help. The University of Rochester, where Joseph Cole, who this year has been regional vice president of Region 2, will serve as the supervisor, if you will, and Dean Helen Nowlis, who has been Dean of Students on that staff, will serve as the National Director, and has been released for the year full time to pursue this program to its, we hope, successful conclusion.

I want to make a sharp distinction between what has just been reviewed and what I am now going to talk about, because there is a second point that needs to be made in the drug-narcotics area.

In order to really implement this program beyond the first year, there is a strong interest on the part of the Food and Drug Administration, that agency, in encouraging institutions to make application directly to the Food and Drug Administration, for this coming year for pilot projects, or feasibility studies in the area of assessing the existing techniques and materials, and developing techniques and materials useful for deans in their work in assisting students, talking to students in the area of drugs and narcotics.

Any institution that is interested in and can organize and submit a proposal for such a pilot project or feasibility study should address his inquiry or proposal to Dr. James Fox, Director, Division of Drug Studies and Statistics, B.D.A.C., Bureau of Drug Abuse and Control, Food and Drug Administration, Arlington, Virginia.

We have assured the Food and Drug Administration in our discussions with them regarding the implementation of the program I described earlier, that there would be at least some institutions interested in developing proposals early in this area. Furthermore, it is important that such programs be developed and be submitted, since a possible follow-up of the first year would be a second year effort to further test the results of the pilot studies, or feasibility studies, and further develop the techniques and materials useful for the effort of the dean to assist students in their communications with students regarding these several types of problems.

The philosophy on which we have based our approach to F.D.A., and with which we at least at the

present time address our pursuit of this program, is that we are concerned to be informed, as deans, and as deans to have our students informed when they make a choice; that we are neither in the enforcement nor in the moralizing business. Among ourselves, or in our relationship to the students, it is not to deny that there might be some validity to that approach, but to suggest only that this has been the approach we have used in our approach to F.D.A., so that it was clear we were not getting into this program in terms of enforcement, or becoming an enforcement arm of the Food and Drug Administration; and this is in the context of the letter that I think most of you received from Dr. Goddard in this regard.

There are a number of other major items which have concerned this division, but they are not major enough to be listed this morning.

This has been a very fruitful year for me personally, in terms of the kind of stimulation that the Advisory Board has given me, and I hope that the board, in its efforts to get underway a program implementing the new structure in the area of Association personnel services, has at least in some modest fashion made a dent in an effort to meet its responsibilities.

I think that is about it, unless there are some questions that anyone has, or may have, regarding the drug problem.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Are there questions or comments from the floor?

Earle, I think everyone would like to know just roughly when they might expect to receive some specific announcements, and the address in writing, and so forth to their home office, from Dr. Fox.

DEAN CLIFFORD: A good point. I skipped that. We have a meeting scheduled in Washington tentatively for July 7th, to iron out the final details of the contract. Assuming that we are successful with that effort, within the following two weeks we will have another meeting of the division to discuss the policies related to program implementation. This meeting will probably be at Rochester with Joe Cole and Dr. Helen Nowlis, and such representatives of the Food and Drug Administration as are required for this purpose.

My guess would be that if all goes well, you should hear in writing from probably Dr. Nowlis, by the first week in August. If we are going to implement the organization for the national meeting, and

solicit evidences or indications of your interest in participating in that activity by early fall -- and here I am talking, I guess, about late September or early October -- we must get this out to you at least early in August. Our target, in terms of schedule, is roughly along those lines at this point.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Earle, for a report of a great deal of work, excellently done.

I remind you again that we are taking a leadership role which does not exclude or limit the participation of the number of other related professional associations. This is not a NASPA project, but a higher education project in which we are working arm in arm with colleague associations.

I now call upon the director of the Division of Research and Publications, Dr. Peter Armacost.

DR. PETER H. ARMACOST (Program Director, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C. Report of the Advisory Committee to the Director of Research and Publications): Members of the Division of Research and Publications for the past year have been Dean Thomas Dutton of Oakland University in Michigan, Dean Jerry Godard of Earlham College, Dean Jack Graham of Southern Illinois University, Dean Mark Smith, Denison University, and Philip Tripp of the U. S. Office of Education.

These men and myself have met four times during the past year and done an extraordinary amount of work between our meetings, and indeed, each of you in the audience has done a good deal of work for us as well, and we are greatly appreciative.

I have a written report which I will distribute to you, and I will attempt here to just highlight several features from it. The report was written for the simple reason that we had need of a document which we could circulate to some people who are not in NASPA but are interested in our work, and who can be of great value to the Association if we can establish proper working relationships; and we thought we would kill two birds with one stone.

We spent a good deal of time this year trying to define the exact role which is appropriate for a research and publications division in an Association such as ours. As a result, we are attempting to design the NASPA research and publications program so as to assist the dean in the daily performance of his duties.

In general, our strategy is to design projects which will stimulate NASPA members to take positions on critical issues for student personnel administrators, and to discover the facts related to these issues through bibliographical research and empirical research on the local campus.

I have listed in the written report a number of more specific functions which we should like to perform throughout the coming years.

In order to launch the work of our division we have conducted three projects this year. In the long run, however, we view our primary task as the establishment of research priorities, the identification of capable researchers and writers and the assignment of research responsibilities to capable and interested persons. We desire the broadest possible participation of NASPA members in the work of the Division of Research and Publications. Furthermore, we believe that maximum productivity will result from a "task force" approach in which one or two NASPA members, in close geographical proximity to one another, are assigned a project of interest to them. We hope to be able to identify potential "task forces" and we have a list of projects to be assigned to them.

At the same time, we feel that some projects are of such importance, scope and complexity as to be better conducted, in consultation with our advisory board, by able researchers who have access to research equipment and personnel and who are not burdened with administrative responsibility. Thus, we hope to establish close working relationships with regional work centers where major research in higher education and student personnel work is frequently conducted and where there are a number of graduate students. We have already discussed in the division two projects which we feel are best handled in this fashion and we have initiated contact with potential principal investigators.

We also hope that some of the work of the division may actually be conducted by graduate students under the close supervision of a major adviser interested in the work of our division.

One other comment about our modus operandi, as it were. We are concerned with the frequency with which each NASPA member is asked to participate in research projects. In general, we do not feel that NASPA members have been overworked in this regard yet, but we anticipate a time when this may be the case, and we want to guard against it. To this end, we have taken two steps in the research office, which is

a glorified title for a cubicle next to my secretary's office. We have established a fairly elaborate record keeping system where we hope to keep track of participation of NASPA members in our projects, and others, so as to minimize duplication in our requests to them, and keep some control on this.

Secondly, we have asked COSPA through Bob Shaffer to consider the possibility of taking a look at the research activities of the various Associations in order to minimize duplication, and exercise some control in this regard.

Very briefly, let me talk with you about five of the projects which are either under way or in advanced stages of planning.

You are all familiar with the project which we entitled, "An Exploratory Investigation of Selected Assumptions and Beliefs of Student Personnel Administrators." This project was designed to stimulate NASPA members to consider some of the assumptions and value connections which are basic to student personnel work and to find out how widely these are held by student personnel administrators. As an exploratory investigation it was also conducted in order to identify areas in which additional empirical investigation or position papers might be of particular value. We hope to follow-up a good many of these items with critical comments and other appropriate research strategies. This was just an exploratory investigation to see where future work might be fruitful.

Parenthetically, we sent questionnaires to 691 members of NASPA, and we received complete questionnaires from 522, which is an extraordinarily good return, we think, from people who are as busy as you folks are. We are greatly appreciative and hope that it will be a productive project.

A preliminary report was given yesterday. We hope to have a detailed report available for you in the fall.

The second project perhaps is more appropriately classified as publications than research. On the assumption that the whole story is not being told about the contemporary college student, that student personnel administrators have important information on the subject but have seldom been asked to speak, and that deans have a responsibility to "speak out," we asked a number of NASPA members to write a brief statement in response to the question: "From your perspective, do you think that the image of the college student currently being presented to his various publics

is fair and accurate?" We have now 47 such statements. Mark Smith and Dean Jerry Godard have edited the first draft of this. We plan to release this at the time of the ACE meeting, at which time NASPA has an unusual opportunity to talk with members of the Education Writers Association, on the subject of the contemporary college student.

I may say that we hope this will be a very fruitful discussion which will present a fairly balanced picture. This will be a meet-the-press type arrangement, with plenty of give and take on both sides. If any of you are going to be in New Orleans on February 12th, we invite you to join in the fun.

The third project is "An Investigation of Institutional Policy on Controversial Topics," where we asked each NASPA voting delegate, or some member of his staff, to participate in a survey designed to provide "baseline" information which we hope to be of value to you, and which indeed is seen as a response to many of the requests which I have received from my office and which I am sure many of you have, by means of small surveys conducted by colleges.

We are hoping to obtain information about the extent to which colleges and universities have formulated institutional policies on a number of selected topics, on the purposes and rationale for these policies, the methods by which the policies were formulated, and the nature of their implementation.

We are conducting a post card follow-up at the present time, and may I put in a plug that any of you who do have the questionnaire on your desk, if you would send it in when you get home we would greatly appreciate it.

Two other areas have been of major concern to us this year, and we have spent some time drafting proposals and identifying a proper strategy for dealing with them.

One we have called a study of "Perceptions of the Dean of Students and his Responsibilities." This we view as a rather major investigation, and we have initiated conversations with several potential study directors, and would of course anticipate seeking out side support for activities in this area. As we have discussed this project our advisory board has felt that one of our purposes should be to stimulate a re-examination of the role of the dean of students on each NASPA campus with the broadest possible involvement of the president, academic dean, business manager, dean of students, faculty and students and

with the dean of students as the initiator and director of the self-study on each campus.

We would hope that such a project would provide information on such matters as the contrasting perceptions of presidents, deans and others with regard to the nature of the important contributions of the dean of students with regard to the president's criteria of evaluation of the work of the dean of students, and with the dean's awareness of these criteria as the president has developed them in his own thinking. We would hope to obtain information on the degree to which the dean's perception of his responsibilities influence the way in which the president and other administrators view the work of the office of the dean of students, and on the nature and clarity of communication within the academic community about what it is the dean of students and his staff is actually doing.

Another kind of project which we have in the planning stages is a direct follow-up of the Williamson-Cowan study which has been done for NASPA. This, too, we feel should be conducted by an investigator who is in one of our regional work centers, with access to proper equipment and with the research expertise which we do not have on our division.

We hope that this follow-up study would do two things: 1) solicit a representative sample of student opinion in a cross-section of American colleges and universities (rather than dealing only with the perceptions of the student body presidents and student newspaper editors, neither of whom can be classified as typical). 2) We hope it would focus attention and further thought on restrictions of student freedom in addition to those studied by Williamson and Cowan, which you will recall focused on the freedom of expression and related matters.

It is just possible, for instance, that a good many students would give up a free speakers policy in order to gain other kinds of freedom which they think are more important to them or more immediate to them. We feel that this is information which the dean should have as he begins to communicate within the academic community about these matters.

There are many other projects which we have talked about. These will, we hope, be undertaken by various members of the Association, or by graduate students who are interested in NASPA, and most of our activity during the next year, in addition to carrying out our plans on these two projects that I have just mentioned, will be in putting these questions in

researchable form and finding proper people to take care of them.

One thing I would just like to mention in passing. We have given some attention to the broader scope of our publications program, and are trying to stay out of the hair of our very excellent editorial board. One kind of publication that has been of interest to us is the possibility of a monograph series. We are in the process of identifying a series of topics which would be of particular interest to NASPA members, or where there has been some need expressed. We would hope to solicit manuscripts on these topics which would be of interest to you.

One special publication has been discussed by our division, and with the approval of the executive committee we have now tapped an editorial board for this project. This is a publication in connection with our 50th anniversary conference in Atlanta in 1969. The publication which really is intended to capture the flavor of NASPA through the first fifty years will contain a short development and history of NASPA, edited portions of key addresses which have been of major significance at NASPA conventions, and "NASPA flavor" contained in short quips and quotes which have provided memorable moments at NASPA conventions.

We are very grateful for the cooperation which you have given us this year. Surely a research program is not possible unless it is of interest to the members, unless they are willing to participate, and we earnestly solicit your reactions and support. At the same time, we would like to thank the Executive Committee and Glen Nygreen for their encouragement. This has been a very exciting year for us. It has been without a doubt for each of the six of us the best professional development experience we have ever had. We thank you for this opportunity.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Peter. Are there questions or comments on this report?

I think the three divisions from which you have heard have been setting new standards for activity in leadership. They have proved the wisdom of the restructuring of the Association, which was enacted a year ago.

For our fourth division we had a disappointing resignation, and a period of inactivity. We have now identified and appointed a director of that division, the Division of Professional Relations and Legislative Affairs. He has just taken office. He



no doubt will have not much of an action report, but I would like to call to the platform Dean Chester Peters, who is the newly appointed Director of that Division, for whatever report he wishes to make at this time.

DEAN CHESTER E. PETERS (Report of the Advisory Committee to the Director of Professional Relations and Legislation): Thank you very much, Glen.

I have not had a lot of time since Friday evening to come up with a report such as you have already heard from the other three divisions. I might indicate that two members of the Professional Relations and Legislation Committee are here, Bob Chick of Oregon State, and Gil MacDonald of Northeastern.

We have had one meeting already to try to outline some of our problems and program area. We also had a meeting on Monday night in which we had about twenty representatives of various other professional associations, to have a chance to interact with our committee and also to get acquainted with each other. We felt that this was a profitable venture.

We are under way also in the assessment of other state and regional student personnel associations throughout the United States, which we think will have some value as it relates to our increasing membership, in support and providing financial assistance to the establishment of our national office, secretary, and so on.

We are interested in improving, strengthening and improving the relationships with the various other associations, and we have identified some that we think we should place major emphasis on this next year.

We are interested in any joint projects which they are undertaking, and which NASPA is undertaking, and relating those back to our various working groups that will help us in this particular area.

We also feel that there are certain areas in the relationship with other professions or in the legislative affairs where NASPA should be taking positions. Earle Clifford has already mentioned the selective service and what has been done there. Others are financial aids, civil rights, and perhaps some things in the international arena.

Peter has mentioned the Educational Writers Conference at COSPA which he and Tom Emmet are going

to continue to work out the details on, and we feel that this is going to be an excellent program.

As we met, the Committee is concerned about what we do in the area of legislation, and how far we go, or how we divide our time as regards the various professional associations we relate to. We think we must provide the membership with as much information, as accurate and up-to-date as possible in the area of legislation and affairs. We certainly have not come to a decision on how far we go to influence or bring about changes.

We realize that a great number of our members are affected directly, budgetwise and otherwise, with programs in which the federal government passes a law, and we have to provide the assistance or the budgetary support on our campuses, and it does affect our operation. We have not determined yet where we will move in the area of trying to influence this.

We will try to get together as soon as we possibly can, in the fall, and I would hope that in April, a year from now, in Cincinnati we will have a report which will have indicated that we have been carrying out the responsibilities which we are assigned, and that it will be a fruitful, productive year. Thank you.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Chet. Any comments or questions?

I now call to the rostrum the energetic and hard working Director of our Placement activities, Dean Richard E. Hulet. Dick.

DEAN RICHARD E. HULET (Placement Officer): Thank you, President Nygreen. I could not help but be struck by what I felt was a significant change in the nature of this program, which represents reports from the directorship of the Association.

Those of us -- and there are still some in the audience and some on the stage -- who have been attending NASPA and NADAM conferences for a great many years (this is my twenty-fourth) cannot help but be impressed with the nature of the change in the work of this Association.

This particular session, this business session which was about the last day of the Conference every year, for a great many years was a joke session in which each succeeding speaker tried to outdo the other. It provided for the membership a delightful catalog and library of jokes throughout the year, but

I am not sure what else it did. In many ways, being a somewhat nostalgic person, I somewhat miss these, but I cannot help but point with pride at the change that has occurred and the kind of activity, professional activity which this Association has done over the years, which is represented by the reports which the Directors have given you this morning.

I might mention that since the 47th Anniversary Conference last year in Washington, we have sent to the membership a number of reports indicating available candidates, and available positions in the field.

On April 2nd and 3rd of this year, in cooperation with NAWDC, we held a placement service between the main part of NAWDC and the beginnings of APGA Conference. I believe that this attempt, which was really twofold, an opportunity to demonstrate our interest in cooperating with NAWDC in these matters, plus an opportunity for our membership to be able to have some kind of placement activity in the spring, I believe that this Washington placement activity was, indeed, a successful one although it really did not serve a great many people.

After the Anniversary Conference last year the Executive Committee thought that we should modify the format of the placement service operation. There always is the danger of the "flesh market" connotation to any placement activity. Our organization's placement service has been quite an informal one for a great many years, under Fred Turner and "Shorty" Nowotny, and I have tried to continue it in that vein. We have tried to avoid conflicts with general sessions and with the larger sessions of the Anniversary Conference, but one cannot help but have the "flesh market" approach when you are having a placement service continue throughout the Conference. So the Executive Committee asked that we try to have the Placement Service operating only the two days prior to the Conference.

This year, for the first time, we operated the Placement Service on Saturday and Sunday. I am sure that this had some influence on the fact that we had quite a light placement activity this year. Perhaps this is good. I am not sure. But we will ask the membership to study whether or not this particular arrangement will be desirable for future Anniversary Conferences.

There is another factor which we find it difficult to evaluate, and that is, of course, the distance. And quite another one, the timing of the

Conference. Whether or not June, Seattle, and the two days prior were the main influencing factors, we are not quite sure.

At any rate, we had a situation where at this Conference we registered about 65 very good jobs. They are primarily still available, because we had about 12 candidates for these 65 jobs.

We do have quite a number of listings of active candidates in the files, and immediately following the Conference, as soon as I can get home, we will work another mailing, adding the new candidates we received Saturday and Sunday to these, and we will send to the membership both the active list of candidates and the list of available positions.

We hope that those of you who are looking desperately for staff at this late date will be successful in this venture. I am almost tempted to say, "rots of ruck." (Laughter) But I am afraid we have a responsibility which transcends this, so we will send to you the listings of available personnel. We hope from this that you can receive some assistance between now and next September.

We will, of course, operate our Placement Service throughout the year, and you will be receiving mailings between now and the next Anniversary Conference.

If any of you have some suggestions which would be helpful to us, either in the way of format of the presentation of the Placement Service, or in terms of the way in which we can serve the membership better, we would be delighted to have your suggestions. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Dick.

Most of us would say "me too" in his expression of pride about the department and extensiveness of the professional work of the Association. I might just say that one of the bits of nostalgia has to do with Dick Hulet's own stories. We miss them this morning.

I think you would all like to hear a brief report from the Director of our Pre-Conference, Dean Bill Brown, who has carried this very difficult load with distinction for the past three years, and we are mighty proud of his efforts. Bill.

DEAN C. WILLIAM BROWN (Report of Pre-Conference Chairman): Thank you, President Nygreen.

The Pre-Conference was held this year on the two days preceding the regular Conference, beginning at noon on Friday, and extending through the combined luncheon session on Sunday.

We had a total of 41 participants, divided into two groups, and the seminar workshop was held on the same basis, being built around the case method, as was employed previously.

In taking a look at some of the changes that might be of interest, if not significant, to the membership I would like to point out a few things that were done in a slightly different manner.

This goes back to the beginning in an effort to help penetrate on our member campuses, and an effort to help on the non-member campuses to develop an awareness of this opportunity of participating in the Pre-Conference also, if they have any desire.

In coordination with Earle Clifford and the Division of Association Personnel and Services, we did develop a pamphlet which was mailed to member institutions, and then on a limited basis made available to the regional vice presidents in order that they might use it in their work with certain non-member institutions in their regions.

Based upon some earlier comments, we did provide the opportunity for those experienced in the field to attend also. So the mailing was not geared to new deans, but to new deans or experienced deans. We did have some who indicated considerable experience who came this year.

In addition, for the first time, we set up a rate that would reflect membership, so that those who were not members paid an additional fee equivalent to what it would have cost them to become a member.

From some of the comments given from the participants, we did decrease the time for which they were scheduled in activity.

One other change is that we had originally planned to have an outside speaker, as was used at last year's Conference, but with some difficulty in evaluating the real interest, and the number who would be participating, since we were coming to the north-west, we hesitated; and then on the basis of lower enrollment than we had originally planned at least to be able to handle in case there was interest -- and we were geared to go to four groups of 25, if there was sufficient interest -- we decided to include some

documentary films as a means of getting at a case instead of providing the outside speaker.

At this time I would like to say that if there were successes in the workshop, it largely depends upon the participants, and I hope it has been a profitable and enjoyable experience for them.

I would like to thank Tom Emmet and O. D. Roberts, who gave considerable assistance in the planning for the Pre-Conference; also to recognize the work and assistance given by members of the committee. John Gillis of Illinois State University has helped to a large extent in the work, in the administration of the program. Foster Northrup, who is the director at one of our residence halls at Purdue, did considerable work on our own campus in working for it, and Reginald Root, the Dean of Men at Washington, gave outstanding service in the liaison work with the hotel, which has been outstanding also in our preparation for it.

In addition, Don Marsh and Lou Stamatakos served as case leaders, and John Blackburn and Arleigh Williams as reactors.

I might comment briefly that there was some speculation that we had selected the reactors on the basis of battle scars. I want to assure you that that is not true. We felt that they had certain experiences and approaches that would be of interest to those who participated. At one of the tables one day a suggestion was made that as an Association we might award battle ribbons to show some of the experiences that others in the Association might know the experiences that some of the others have had. I think they did an outstanding job for our Pre-Conference participants.

In addition, Larry Brammer and Tom Hodgson of Washington University participated on a panel where we discussed professional preparation.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Bill.

In Dean Clifford's report there was reference to the programs being developed in the international area. I would like now to ask Bill Blaesser if he would not come to the microphone and make a brief description of what is in store for us as an Association in the international area. Bill.

DEAN WILLARD W. BLAESSER (Report of Committee on International Student Programs): Glen just

told me what to say. (Laughter) I really thought that Earle Clifford had covered the international arena. I will try to be just a little bit specific, hopefully without becoming too long winded.

The Pre-Conference workshop referred to, we have planned for a day or a day and a half prior to the Cincinnati meetings. The intent of this workshop is to focus on what we call the International dimensions of the role of the student personnel administrator. This will be carried out with a good deal of help from NAFSA, in the field service consultant stage. Some of you have had these consultants on your campus. We hope the encounter has been worthwhile.

At any rate, we plan to have small working sessions in which our consultants will be primarily the people from the NAFSA Field Service who have already been working in this area, helping us as student personnel administrators perhaps to give more attention to the international arena and to be of more help in what we might broadly say are the international educational dimensions of student personnel administration.

Information on this will be sent out in early fall. We hope to be able to handle around fifty people in this kind of a Pre-Conference workshop, the study chore mentioned by Earle Clifford. This will be carried on in coordination with the experiment on international living. There is a possibility of this being set forth in January or February of this coming year, or in October or November. The third project, that of the seminar in India, we are still hopeful that this will be mounted by this coming January and February. This is a matter of close cooperation with the Institute of International Education, and here too we are hopeful that perhaps by late November we may have specific information, along with the funds referred to by Earle, and we will be open for applications.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Bill.

These are the kinds of projects which involve an extraordinarily large number of conferences with both private and government agencies, and when these come to fruition they will be of real service to us and our membership.

I now call for the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, and in so doing, I must tell you that we think so much of his work, the Association at its last annual meeting abolished the position of Secretary-Treasurer. Nonetheless, our Secretary-Treasurer is completing his third three-year term. Dr. Carl Knox.

SECRETARY-TREASURER CARL W. KNOX (Report of Secretary-Treasurer): Thanks, Glen.

In your registration packets there should have been two reports, one from the treasurer, and the other from the secretary. There is no need to repeat those.

Just one observation: If money talks, then the theme song of this Association is that old standard known as "Whispering." (Laughter)

Speaking of money, I remind you that the Conference office will be happy to cash any checks as long as our cash lasts. It is a service that in the nine years experience I have had we have had three NSF checks during that nine year period. They were all resolved successfully. (Laughter)

One last point. Would you please keep us informed concerning changes in personnel and happenings at your own home front. One of the real challenges, believe it or not, is keeping an accurate roster, an accurate mailing list for our Journal, for our Conference Chairman, for the central office. So in other words, please keep those letters coming in to us.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Carl. He makes a brief report, but it represents hours of dedicated and good service.

We have had a committee studying the problem of a central office and the problem of the budget structure of this Association, visited in Washington, D. C., considered a great many alternatives. The Chairman of this study committee has been our Past Conference Chairman, O. D. Roberts, and I have asked him to make a very brief report, on very short notice, just outlining to you the essential of what we have done, and what some of the problems we face are, so that you will be knowledgeable about them, also, so they will appear in the record. O. D.

DEAN O. D. ROBERTS (Report of Committee on Association Budget and Central Office): Thank you, Glen.

You have heard the reports of the directorates and the other activities of the Association, and I think it must be recognized that as these activities increase so does the need for funds, because these activities do take expenditures of money.

My committee this year has been studying this problem very carefully. We are far from having



crystallized anything. We are trying to develop budget structure, budget control processes. We have examined the income of the Association from every conceivable angle. As Carl says, we are definitely whispering. I think it is imperative that all of the members recognize that there are problems in the financial area that go with the increased activity.

We have reviewed the Pre-Conference fees, the fees for the Anniversary Conference itself. We are trying to study the dues structure of the Association. We hope that you will all recognize that these things must be under constant surveillance.

We have been doing some work on the possibility of a central office. We have considered, I suspect, as high as a dozen different sites, ranging from Washington to various regions of the United States. We have definite plans for the establishment of an office as soon as funds are available, because we feel that this will implement the work of our directorates and our various other agencies of the Association.

The financial area, of course, is never intended to serve as a dog guarding a bone, but to actually help the directorates and help the other activities areas to have the funds necessary to carry on the work of your Association the way you want it carried on.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, O.D.

There will continue to be basic changes in our method of operation, and in the formal structure, including the fees and other costs of the Association, but you will all be party to those as they develop.

The report of the President you have heard. In the report of the President is contained the work that all of these people and many others, for whom there is not time to allow them to present their work this morning. I am sure all of us, as student personnel administrators, are deeply in their debt.

I have just one thing to add. All of this is volunteer work. Some people wait to be drafted; some people make suggestions and ask to be put to work. All you need to do to take a prominent part in NASPA is to speak to one of these people directing divisions or to any one of the officers, and you will be put to work. We need help. As our program extends and strengthens, there is an abundance of opportunity for those who wish to work, without exclusion of anyone.

Now we shall turn to the constitutional changes which are before you. The voting is by institutional delegate or, in his absence, one of the accredited representatives.

I shall ask Past President Don DuShane, Regional Vice President from this area, to guide me on this, and any questions of order and procedure I shall refer to him.

If you will turn to your Constitution, turn back the title page and look immediately at Article III, and then look at the explanation on the cover sheet of the two-page statement, and on the second page of that statement to the precise change.

Article III, Section 1. We now have a suggested amendment which would make any accredited junior college or community college offering two years of transferrable collegiate credit eligible for institutional membership. We have discussed this at great length. It has some controversial aspects. Not all members of NASPA are enthusiastic about it, but neither are all opposed.

It is the belief of your Executive Committee that the time has come to consider this change and to express your will upon it as it is printed. It now would read:

"Any four (4) year educational institution approved by its regional accrediting body" [the following phrase is added] "and any fully accredited junior or community college offering two (2) years of courses carrying transferrable collegiate credit" [end of addition] "shall be eligible to apply for membership."

This is before you by action of the Association. Is there a motion for its adoption?

DEAN FRANKLIN BACON (Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia): I so move.

DEAN O. D. ROBERTS: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Is there discussion? In the back of the room. Please identify yourself for the record.

DEAN ARTHUR JALKANEN (Oakland Community College, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan): My affiliation with NASPA began with the University of Rhode Island, and since my membership carries from there, I came here this year as an institutional delegate from the University of Rhode Island, and I suppose I am cheating a

little bit, because I am actually speaking on behalf of the community college movement.

I doubt if there is any time in the NASPA movement when we can affect the student population so much as we can at this time. I think all of you recognize that by 1970 half of our students will have attended a community college. Today we have something like 600 to 700 community colleges, some of these with a membership of over 12,000 to 15,000.

I think that you recognize that by 1970 half of our students will have attended one of our institutions. And if you want to instill some of those values and be able to deal with students who are actually freshmen in their third year, you had better begin talking with the deans in community colleges.

I would suggest that this particular amendment before you is one of the most significant votes that you will be taking in many years. So I would formally urge you to adopt this particular amendment.

Thank you, Glen.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Art.

Is there other comment? Are you ready to come to a vote? [Calls for the question]

We will declare the question called. Will all those entitled to vote show their approval of this by rising, please. Thank you.

Will those opposed do the same.

There being no opposition I shall declare the amendment adopted unanimously. (Applause)

I now call your attention to Article III, Section 3, subparagraph iii, which is at the bottom of the first page of the Constitution.

This Article defines Associate Member. The amendment as printed on the second sheet of the other document is merely a clarifying amendment and adds the words "any eligible collegiate" in place of "any member institution," which clarifies a difficult point in our membership requirements. Article III, Section 3, subparagraph iii would be:

"ASSOCIATES: Other persons employed in higher education not connected with any eligible collegiate institution, or those engaged in other areas of activity within a member institution, as approved by the Membership Committee."

Is there a motion to adopt?

DEAN CHESTER E. PETERS (Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas): I move to adopt.

DEAN EARLE CLIFFORD: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Is there any discussion? Is there objection to proceeding with the vote? [The question was called]

Hearing none, I shall ask all those in favor to say aye; all those opposed to say no. It is so carried.

I now call your attention to page 2 of the Constitution, and I call your attention to Article IV, Section 4 -- not Section 3 as printed on the second sheet.

In Article IV, Section 4 the Executive Committee has recommended for your approval a change in the term of the Conference Chairman. We have found some advantage in asking the Conference Chairman to serve as an assistant for a year, becoming acquainted with the problems of arranging for a Conference of our growing size, and then limiting his term to two years, rather than three, as Conference Chairman.

All of us who have served in this role do approve this, and recommend it, and I therefore place before you the amendment as printed for your consideration. So Article IV, Section 4, would be:

"The Conference Chairman shall serve as Assistant Conference Chairman for one year from the time of election at the annual meeting and for two years as Conference Chairman until the succeeding Conference Chairman elected at the second following annual meeting is ready to succeed him."

Is there a motion for its adoption?

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD (Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois): I so move.

DEAN FRED W. BRYSON (Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas): I will second the motion.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: It has been moved and seconded to adopt this clarification of the term of the Conference Chairman. Is there discussion? Is there any objection to proceeding to a vote? [The question was called]

I ask all those in favor to signify by saying aye; those opposed to say no. It is carried and so ordered.

I now call to your attention Article IV, Section 6, which is to restore a provision which existed until this last year, that the immediate Past President serve for one year as a member of the Executive Committee. If someone wants to have fun, he can move to table this for another year, and I will recognize it. (Laughter)

Is there a motion for its adoption?

DEAN WILLIAM D. SWIFT (Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas): I so move.

DEAN ALLEN C. BROOKS (Principia College, Elsau, Illinois): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: All right, it has been moved and seconded that the motion as printed be adopted. Is there any discussion? No vote to table? (Laughter) Is there objection to proceeding to the vote?

All those in favor please say aye; any opposed, say no. It is so ordered.

Is there other business to come before the Convention at this time?

I have the privilege to make an announcement to which I most respectfully call your careful attention. We have individual copies of this which, Bob, if you would put on the chair by the door, people can pick up.

We were called yesterday by the officers of the U. S. National Student Association to tell us that under a grant from NIMH they are able to make available copies of the volume "Stress, Students and the College Experience," which is the report of the Conference held near Washington last fall, which I know some of you attended. They can make available a sufficient number of copies without cost so that you could give one to each and every member of your freshman class in orientation next fall.

The name and address of the person to write to is on this sheet. One pertinent fact is not on the sheet. You must get your request in by July 5, which is a week from today. I guess this is an advantage, if you think this is worthwhile, to have come to this Conference because we will not have an opportunity to

get the word out to our member institutions otherwise. What other steps they are taking, I do not know, but if you are interested in obtaining free sufficient copies to give to each of your freshmen students, and to use in your orientation programs, you have only to write, not later than July 5, to the address given on this sheet.

A final item of business is the report of the Committee on Nominations, and I call upon our Senior Past President present, the distinguished Dean of Tulane University, Dean John H. Stibbs. Jack.

DEAN JOHN H. STIBBS (Report of Committee on Nominations): Thank you, Mr. President.

As indicated on page 36 of the program, the Committee on Nominations is made up of all living past presidents in attendance, plus six members elected by the Association.

This year, at this Conference, there were six past presidents of the Association and five of the six elected members, and we have met. Unfortunately Mark Smith was not able to be at this Conference.

The assignment of the Committee is to nominate certain principal officers of the Association. For the benefit of new members particularly, you may wish to look at pages 6 and 7 of the program. Please note that the Regional Vice Presidents are now elected within their regions. The present officers and the Regional Vice Presidents are listed on page 6, and at bottom of page 7 the vice presidents to serve the seven regions for next year are listed.

Under the heading of "Officers" please note that the editor of the NASPA Journal is selected by the Executive Committee of the Association.

The position of Secretary-Treasurer, as a general elected office was disestablished in the new Constitution last year, to take effect this year. Henceforth, the Executive Committee will name a Secretary, selected from among its members, and a Controller, who may or may not be a member of the Executive Committee.

As you well know, at the conclusion of this Conference Dean Edmund Williamson of Minnesota becomes the President of the Association for next year.

The business of the Nominating Committee therefore has been the preparation of nominations for the office of Conference Chairman-Designate, and

President-Designate. The Conference Chairman-Designate is to serve as an assistant to Conference Chairman Tom Emmet for the meeting in Cincinnati in 1967, and to be in charge for 1968 at Minneapolis, and in 1969 in Atlanta. These are crucial meetings: 1968 is the 50th Anniversary Conference of the Association and offers an unparalleled opportunity to view both past and future in student personnel administration; 1969 will be our first opportunity to meet jointly with NAWDC, a step which may hopefully lead to a clearing of some of the uncertainties among professional personnel relations.

The proposal of the Nominations Committee is that we name Co-Chairmen-Designate. Of these, one is Dr. Peter Armacost. It is proposed that he have primary responsibility for the meeting at the 50th Anniversary Conference. Peter's work in the division of Research and Publications has included the preparation of a Golden Anniversary publication to highlight NADAM-NASPA and the entire history of student personnel administration. He knows Minneapolis and has demonstrated energy and imagination in the work of his division.

The relationships of NASPA-NAWDC have been included in Dean Earle Clifford's division of Association Personnel and Services. The Atlanta meeting demands a sensitive and thoughtful approach which Earle has evidenced in his program. We propose therefore that Dean Clifford take the primary responsibility for the program at Atlanta.

We all know the post of Conference Chairman demands professional devotion and imagination. To repeat, Mr. President, the Committee nominates Peter Armacost and Earle Clifford for Conference Co-Chairmen-Designate to assist Tom Emmet next year at Cincinnati, and then to serve jointly at Minneapolis and Atlanta.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Jack. Are there other nominations from the floor? I think that you would recognize this is hardly the kind of task for which a man would volunteer. (Laughter) It is a man-killing task and it is a demand and a deep drain on his institutional budget, and we are grateful that these people have acceded to arm twisting.

There being no further nominations, do I hear a motion that the nominations be closed and the white ballot be cast?

DEAN FRED BRYSON: I so move.

DEAN BURNS B. CROOKSTON (Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: There being no discussion, all those who are in favor of the motion as put please say aye; any opposed say no. It is so ordered.

Since you have met both of these gentlemen before, there is no need to call them to the platform but our deep gratitude goes to them for their willingness to accept this assignment.

DEAN STIBBS: Our next assignment, for President-Designate the Committee proudly nominates one of the outstanding members of our organization who has served us long and faithfully, Dean Carl Knox of Illinois. (Applause)

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Carl, despite the applause, parliamentary procedures require that I ask if there are any other nominations from the floor?

Hearing none, is there a motion that the nominations be closed and a white ballot be cast?

DEAN WARREN H. SHIRLEY (Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida): I so move.

DEAN O. W. LACY (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pennsylvania): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: There being no discussion of this, all those in favor of the motion please say aye; any opposed say no. It is carried.

Carl, I think you are entitled to the privilege of the microphone.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE KNOX: If there is any merit to the old cliché that man's only failure is the failure to do his best, then I assure each and every one of you that I will not fail this trust.

Thank you. (Applause)

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Thank you, Carl, and our congratulations.

Is there any other business to come before this session? Thank you for your patience and your interest. There will be a very brief coffee break and we will be back in session as quickly as we can.

... The Fourth General Session recessed at ten forty-five o'clock ...



FIFTH GENERAL SESSION  
Tuesday - June 28, 1966

The Fifth General Session convened at eleven o'clock, Dean Paul Bloland, Dean of Students, University of Southern California, presiding.

CHAIRMAN BLOLAND: Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Fifth General Session. It is being held in the Grand Ballroom, as you can see, and we are to consider, or reconsider the topic concerning the Berkeley phenomenon.

It is now going on two years since this country's largest student rebellion quietly gathered force and momentum at the University of California at Berkeley. Reams have been written about the Berkeley Revolt and reams more will be written about this phenomenon. An exceedingly complex phenomenon, it is not given to those who were not involved to understand the interplay of personalities, tradition, emotion, and all the other factors that went into it, and I dare say that those who were involved -- students, staff and faculty -- have not yet been able to sort out from among their own feelings and emotions a comprehensive understanding of the real issues involved and the principle at stake.

However, time does lend detachment and perspective, and some very perceptive and thoughtful analyses can and are being made today. Such an analysis is the one to be presented by Terry Lunsford this morning. I do not care how much you have heard about Berkeley and how surfeited you think you are on the subject, I think as student personnel workers we had better jolly well listen and weigh and evaluate, because the events of 1964-65 are, and will continue to be of major consequence to all of us.

Some of you may recall our speaker as a discussion leader for the panel of faculty and FSM leaders held at the conference on "Order and Freedom on the Campus" in Berkeley about a year ago. He holds an A.B., J.D. (law), University of Chicago Master's degree in Sociology, graduate student in Sociology at Berkeley, and is currently working on his Doctorate in Sociology at Berkeley.

It is interesting to look at some of the background that he presents because he has been in the fold, however briefly -- he does not indicate how long -- as the head of residence hall, and admissions counselor at Chicago, Associate Dean of the State University of New York, Long Island Center at Oyster Bay, director of specialized regional programs, I believe it is for WICHE.

These were programs in institutional research, conferences and publications, in the Western Higher Educational field. An administrative analyst in the President's office, University of California. And today, of course, with the Center at Berkeley.

His topic is, "Perceptions Underlying the Berkeley Phenomenon: Reflections for Student Personnel Administrators."

Without further ado, I would like to present Dr. Terry Lunsford. Terry. (Applause)

DR. TERRY LUNSFORD (Research Associate, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley): Thank you, Paul.

As some of you know, I am here under false pretenses: Professor W. H. Cowley was to have spoken to you at this time, but due to his illness he could not do so. Apparently Dean Emmet believes that the general subject of student protest is of such interest to you that you will put up with any amount of speech-making about it. At any rate, I was asked to talk with you on the basis of a report which I wrote for two research Centers at Berkeley, concerning issues for social and legal research that were raised by the disputes surrounding the Free Speech Movement of 1964-65. [Terry F. Lunsford, The Free Speech Crises at Berkeley, 1964-65: Some Issues for Social and Legal Research, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and Center for the Study of Law and Society, 1965, mimeographed, 253 pp.]

What I want to say today will not in any detail follow that report, with its attempt to be objective and documentary about each point raised. Instead, I would like to talk about some issues concerning the Berkeley disputes that mean trouble for you as deans of students, and which help me to understand some of the trouble that already has occurred. I am afraid you may not like much of what I have to say. But it would seem pointless for me to spend much time on what you are already prepared to believe about student unrest, if there are complexities that still are incompletely understood about some of the issues involved. I am convinced that the latter is the case in many quarters, even today. I speak, therefore, out of the conviction that current student protests cannot be dealt with appropriately -- or perhaps effectively at all -- without explicit or implicit understanding of these issues.

I am sure also that most of you are surfeited with talk of the famous Berkeley events. I confess

that I am. So I will try to comment principally on issues that have relevance beyond those events, for other campuses, other students, other circumstances. However, to do my duty I must begin with the overt issues and events of the "free speech" disputes and the Free Speech Movement, and must use those events as the concrete referent for my own assertions.

## STUDENT PROTEST IN TODAY'S UNIVERSITY

### Overt Issues: Political Expression on a Public Campus

As you know, the "free speech" dispute began in September, 1964 over the University of California's right to enforce its long-standing policies against on-campus advocacy, fund-raising, and recruitment of participants for political and social causes.

University officials at an early point stated, among other things, that a state law and the University's charter in the State Constitution required enforcement of such policies. But these grounds were shortly abandoned after discussion of the conflict became general, involving members of the University's law faculty and the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California. Some administrative "reinterpretations" of the policies were made in September, serving to intensify the student protest rather than lessen it.

By late October, attention had shifted to the question whether the University's policies violated the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The focus of discussion also moved from specific restrictions in the existing policies to questions of whether a public university can constitutionally regulate the content of political expression on its campus at all, as distinguished from what came to be called the "time, place, and manner" of expression.

The distinction between "advocating" action and "mounting" organized protests directed to the outside community came under much inconclusive discussion, as did the legal status of on-campus advocacy that "directly results" in off-campus illegal acts. There was much discussion of the various grounds on which University administrators might legally exercise discretion in penalizing students for on-campus expression. This discussion soon came to center not so much on the time-honored "in loco parentis" doctrine but on the regulations and procedures that are reasonably necessary to protect the "interests" and "functions" of the University as an organization. Questions of "due process," and its proper application to disciplinary action by public universities, became important.

In the spring of 1965, the problem was public use of an allegedly obscene four-letter word on the campus, and the scope of administrative restraint on this difficult category of expression became the focus of public attention. The proper functions of student government came to issue. A study of curriculum reform was initiated by the Academic Senate. University policies on student conduct generally were revised. Further decentralization of University administration was undertaken, assigning more autonomy to the various campuses. During 1965-66, campus controversy has centered (at a much lower level of intensity) on specific interim rules governing the time, place and manner of campus expression, on the processes of student participation in University rule-making, and on proposals for educational innovations contained in the report of the faculty study committee. [University of California, Berkeley, Academic Senate, Education at Berkeley: Report of the Select Committee on Education, Berkeley: Regents of the University of California. Copyright: March, 1966.]

But problems such as these, complex as they are in themselves, were only in the technical sense "at issue" during late 1964. The legal questions have been dealt with at length in a recent issue of The California Law Review ["Symposium: Student Rights and Campus Rules," California Law Review, vol. 54, no. 1 (March, 1966), pp. 1-178.], so I will not dwell on them further here.

### "Second Level" Issues

What may be called a second level of issues was in some ways much more important than the overt, especially the legal, ones. These issues also have wide relevance for other universities, I believe. Colloquially, the most significant ones can be put in the form of questions:

Do the ends justify the means? This issue was much discussed during the Berkeley disputes in relation to the tactics of student protest. As usually put, it is perhaps unfortunate, because some people take the argument to be that ends never justify means, while a little thought suggests that ends are the only things that ever do "justify" tactics used to achieve them. The point is, of course, that there are some means that no end can justify, and that in each case of purposive action we must assess our tactics not only against the goals being sought but against their other consequences as well.

No one needs to be told that it was the Berkeley students' use of mass civil disobedience that caused the greatest upset in the University of California, and made the student "revolt" into a national

cause celebre. Only a few points need to be made here about underlying perceptions of the participants.

First, it is important to understand that non-violent civil protest was the image held by the great majority of students in the Free Speech Movement when they picketed, set up tables on campus in violation of regulations, sat down around the police car in Sproul Plaza, and finally filled Sproul Hall on December 2nd, 1964. Their precedents were events such as the civil rights protests of southern negroes and the San Francisco Sheraton-Palace Hotel sit-in of February, 1964. This fact did not make the protests any more or less legal, of course. And it cannot change the fact that one brief violent exchange did occur between a campus policeman and some protestors on October 1. The importance of the point lies in the fact that the protestors did not see themselves as law-breakers in any sense that connotes moral opprobrium. Instead, they felt that their lawbreaking was a measured, "necessary," and very effective tactic of civil protest, to be used when other means had failed. To them, it constituted a triumph of morality -- of justice -- over legal technicality.

This distinction is important. These students had become accustomed to a view of laws, and their violation, as malleable instruments of human purposes, susceptible of being changed and circumvented and broken in a variety of ways and for a host of differing motives. Some of the FSM leaders in 1964 had just returned from civil rights work in the South, where they had learned that whole states and localities could go very far in maintaining legal and administrative forms intact while systematically avoiding any but a token compliance with the "law of the land" concerning racial integration. They had also learned that mass, non-violent civil disobedience was given credit in the national media for having broken through such patterns, and for producing real, substantive gains in compliance to Supreme Court decisions. It was in this spirit that the student protest leaders turned the weapon of their civil disobedience against what they saw as the arbitrary action of University administrative officials. Considering the strength of emotions on all sides, it is the almost total lack of violence, and the students' rather carefully measured use of the mass disobedience tactic, that requires remarking. The considerable success of their tactics, I have no doubt, encouraged their much wider (and possibly less discriminate) use by other dissenters in other universities.

Second, when civil disobedience by Berkeley students was confined to off-campus situations such as

the Sheraton-Palace Hotel, the official public statements of the University carefully avoided condemning civil disobedience in general terms, or accepting responsibility for deterring students from practicing it. In May, 1964, an official University statement reaffirmed the importance of "law and order" generally, and went on to point out that all illegal actions place heavy burdens on individual consciences. When students turned their "direct social and political action" against the University's own regulations and decisions, however, the situation was changed somewhat. So far as could be gathered from the public statements of University administrators, students' disobedience of campus regulations was considered to be unconditionally illegitimate, and to constitute the major obstacle in the path of reasonable discussion about student grievances. Violations of what was called "Authority duly executed," and "law and order" generally, were repeatedly denounced as unnecessary and unreasonable within the University, whatever their justification in other settings.

The main issue, then, was whether the particular ends of the students -- removal of University restrictions on campus political expression -- justified their intentional and public flouting of University rules. Also involved, however, was the tricky question whether a university must declare itself publicly for the support of "law and order" in general terms, or should in some sense attempt to be "neutral" in principle concerning the interplay of morality and legality. University representatives argued for a time that the University must take an affirmative stance for law-abiding generally.

Subsequently, it seems apparent that the intent has been to deal with such matters case by case, considering student violations of the law to be "University matters" only insofar as they affect his "suitability" as a student. This approach does not satisfy the objections of student protestors in principle, but the way that cases have been handled on the campus recently has satisfied most objectors in practice.

Other matters of tactics were also at issue. On the students' side, again, the rudeness and the vituperations against specific individuals, which were prevalent at FSM rallies, came in for much criticism even from persons otherwise sympathetic to the protestors' cause. For their part, the student protestors viewed the secret meetings and enigmatic public statements by University officials as evidence of an official "conspiracy" against them. They charged that University administrative officials routinely

refused to be open and honest with them. For example, the students discovered and publicized the fact that the University General Counsel had drafted a proposal for legislation tightening rules on campus conduct, at the same time that University administrative representatives were discussing with students a liberalization of campus political rules. The students labeled this "bad faith" on the part of University officials.

And when the Chancellor in late November initiated disciplinary action against students for conduct occurring in early October, the protestors labeled this an administrative "atrocitiy." Although it was formally correct as ordered by the Regents, the Chancellor's action came only a week after the Regents had made a major change in regulations, conceding one of the students' points of protest. Thus the students genuinely felt, and many faculty members agreed with them, that the technically correct action of the Chancellor was morally unjustifiable.

Again, my only point in recalling these events is to illustrate the difference in perceptions of the tactics involved: While the Regents and administrators felt justified in the "normal" procedure of "executive sessions" among officials, and in exercising their formal authority to discipline students without "negotiation," the students refused to honor these formalities, and insisted upon debating the substantive justice and good faith of every action taken by administrative officials. They challenged at every step the University administration's refusal to justify its actions in substantive terms, and its reliance on its formal right to make the disputed decisions.

Who is in charge here? A second kind of issue that was very important involved precisely this student "flouting" of the formal authority of University administrators and Regents. For some University officials, this challenge itself was a strong emotional issue. It was argued that the protested policies should not even be discussed with the students until they had agreed to avoid all future rule-violations. Other officials, and some faculty members as well, repeatedly argued to students that they were endangering the "autonomy" of the University in general by so openly rejecting its official authority -- that they were inviting "intervention" by outside agencies. Generally, the agency referred to was understood to be the State Legislature, in which several members and many constituents had called for statutory restrictions on student and faculty conduct on campus.

In addition, however, the protesting students demanded that the civil police and the courts be allowed

to govern law-enforcement on the campus. They argued that a University has no business being in the law-enforcement field at all, and vowed that they would take their chances along with other citizens if the University's police and deans would refrain from adding their own limitations on student political expression.

During campus discussions of this issue, it developed that many persons in the University had thought the campus was a sanctuary from law enforcement by police of the city, county, and state. However, it soon became known that this was not true. An informal division of labor exists between City police and officers of the University of California Police Department, whereby the University police generally regulate affairs on the campus except for making serious arrests such as those involving felony suspects. The University administration wished to continue this informal arrangement without becoming involved in intensive public discussions of it. But it was also hoped to avoid a court review of University disciplinary actions in the area of campus expression.

Officials were faced with the difficult question of how to avoid all of these things at once. If they gave in before student threats of civil disobedience, it was felt they would encourage student pressures to "negotiate" University rules. On the other hand, if they held fast and students did engage in civil disobedience, as actually occurred, a court test of University discretion in penalizing students for political expression on the campus might result.

Leaders of the Free Speech Movement hoped that a court test, if it occurred, could be made to turn on an issue that would allow them a good possibility of winning the case on appeal. But this was not a governing consideration in their actions. And whether it was achieved in the December 2nd sit-ins arrests, we will not know until their case has traveled through the appeal courts.

The largest problem by far, in this area, was the issue of "political pressure" on administrative decisions, from without and within the campus. The protesting students charged that the original decision to enforce the ban on political expression must have resulted from political pressure brought by powerful local figures, whose premises had been picketed by University students. When later they were told that their protests should stop because they invited outside intervention in University affairs, they labeled this likewise as evidence of administrative surrender to fear of political pressure. And when policy changes



were made, but only after student pressure had been brought within the University, Free Speech Movement leaders argued that this again showed administrators bow not to reason but to power.

The theme was continued throughout the year, with variations which I need not go into. University administrators rejected the charge of having surrendered to power. They saw themselves as "reasonable men of good will" who were capable of and practiced at weighing values, and who either were not subject to pressure or were simply not swayed by it. They continued, however, to refuse any detailed discussion of the issues with the students.

Thus the question "who is in charge here?" was a central one in the Berkeley disputes, despite the fact that it was only infrequently discussed in explicit terms.

What do these people want? Another set of issues concerned the views held by each side about its adversaries' motives. I have mentioned the "conspiracy" theory of administrative action held by the students. It seems equally clear that, at the start, University administrators (and many faculty members) saw the students who began the "free speech" protest primarily as troublemakers. Administrators had been prepared for "Communist youth" drives, in the Chinese-Communists' militant tradition, by a confidential bulletin from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Some administrators tended to assume for a time that student protestors could not have any reasonable substance in their objections, but must be attempting simply to foment upset on campus.

A San Francisco daily newspaper apparently misquoted the President of the University concerning his view of the percentage of Communists involved in the protests, and this caused much recrimination, with charges of Red-baiting, ambiguous denials, and so on. Beyond this, however, it is clear from many official statements that the University administration was worried about "subversion" of the University's basic purposes by propagandists generally -- not only Communists or Fascists, but anyone who was thought to be more interested in selling a dogma than in the free pursuit of truth.

University declarations abound with references to the importance of "facts" as against "opinions," and it apparently was University policy to demand "academic" standards in extracurricular expression as well as in the classroom. There was apparent concern about impressionable youths being led astray

by the siren song of plausible but fundamentally false or over-simplified ideologies. And, above all, it is clear that the official University saw youths primarily as youthful -- that is, as being immature, hasty, often ill-considered in their actions, overly idealistic, fundamentally irresponsible, given to compulsive rejection of authority in their parents' image and so on. It is also clear that the administration saw the students from the start as less able to mount and sustain the moral fervor, efficient organization, level of intellectual analysis, and mass support that they proved to be capable of maintaining.

The very fact of the students' ability in these matters has "proved" to some persons that Communists and adults of various radical persuasions master-minded the whole Free Speech Movement. This is a broadly useful "devil" theory that bedevils us in many situations -- all the more troublesome because it contains a grain of truth, since any legitimate grievance is willingly exploited by radical politicians. Thus it was possible to point out ideological contributions to the FSM by a well-known "old radical" of the Independent Socialist group -- who is, however, violently anti-Communist. It was also known that Communists were present on the campus from time to time, and even that Marxist views are sincerely held by a small minority of the FSM leaders. But this explanation is too easy, allowing us to avoid other facts which are more important. For example, Bettina Aptheker, one of the FSM leaders, who later publicly admitted long-time membership in the Communist Party, was known by participants as one of the moderating voices in FSM discussions.

In any event, as was stated in attorney Jerome Byrne's report to the Regents, it is reasonably clear that there was no substantial manipulation of this particular student protest by anyone. [See The Byrne Report, Reprinted from the Los Angeles Times, Wednesday, May 12, 1965, pp. 14-15.]

Again, I mention this set of facts only because it helps to explain the University administrators' early impressions of the student protestors, and because such impressions continue to arise as convenient explanations of all strong protest, on university campuses and elsewhere. As the Free Speech Movement progressed in 1964, however, I think it is clear that administrative views of its participants and their motives changed, perhaps even to include a grudging admiration of student abilities and idealism. But I am sure that the image of students as over-idealistic, immature, and irresponsible continued as a dominant one in administrative eyes.

## "Underlying" Issues: The University as a Social Organization

Still another way of viewing the issues involved at Berkeley requires us to take a step back, and to look at the modern university as one kind of complex social organization. In public rhetoric we usually refer to the university as "the academic community," or evoke a similar image of unity and harmony. But in fact we all know full well that the large modern university is a community only in a very limited sense. It is a totality of sorts, with a unity of its own, but it also has many internal parts with complicated interrelations, and these relations routinely involve conflict and competition as well as cooperation and stable harmony.

Internal diversity and ambiguity. Even in its most rudimentary structure, of course, we know that the university involves sharply distinct groups -- faculty, students, administration, governing board -- and internal divisions of each group into committees, offices, colleges, disciplines, schools of thought, concurrent majorities, and so on. Moreover, there are beginnings of a sociological literature on less explicit aspects of university structure. [See, for example: Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Authority," AAUP Bulletin, vol. 47, no. 4 (Winter, 1961), pp. 293-302; Neal Gross, "Organizational Lag in American Universities," Harvard Educational Review, vol. 33, no. 1 (Winter, 1963); J. D. Millett, The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962; Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 75-93.]

For example, it has been pointed out that the formal structure of university authority typically involves both a hierarchical, centrally controlled administration and a consensual, technically democratic faculty government. Within this formal structure, authority tends to be extremely ambiguous, with many areas of control left to the initiative of those who are most energetic and interested. Informal sources of authority, such as the expertise of the highly specialized faculty member, tend to modify the formal lines substantially in everyday practice.

University goals are multiple, and so vaguely formulated that many different standards may be used to define "success" in their pursuit. These diverse goals frequently compete for attention and for resources, as when teaching and research both lay claim on scarce faculty time, or on funds for buildings and facilities. Unspoken goals, such as the development of student character, are thought most important of all by some groups

in the university. It is notorious that the specialized professionals in various disciplines and different administrative roles find it increasingly hard to communicate with each other. What may be called institutionalized dissensus within the faculty makes curricular cooperation all but impossible; consequently, it is defined as unnecessary.

Thus in each of the major university groupings, and many minor ones, differing perspectives, characteristic problems, separate interests, and sources of authority arise, each holding sway in its respective jurisdiction. Strong feelings are attached to these differences, no matter how carefully impersonal and "rational" we pretend to be about them. And the process by which operational definition is given to the university's broad aims -- the process determining what actually goes in everyday university life -- is in many ways more like a freeflowing politics than it is like a detached, academic inquiry, or an abstract model of rational administration.

Now, if all this seems a truism to you, but not worth mentioning, I hope you will pardon my dwelling on it for these few moments. I have two reasons:

First, in some of my recent discussions of student unrest and university life with people in "student personnel" work, I have found some reluctance to discuss these internal organizational tensions. The reluctance is not to admit their existence or importance; it is simply a reluctance to discuss them, instead of getting back to the practical problems of how to administer student personnel. Such a view of any organization does, after all, tend to spotlight its inherent problems, its strains and conflicts, as compared with the rhetoric of "academic community." And there is the danger of over-emphasizing this "negative thinking."

Second, during the course of the Berkeley disputes the administration felt obliged to adopt a similar posture, of reemphasizing the common interests among segments of the university, in an attempt to reunify the campus and to stave off the feared intervention by outside forces. This was true despite the well-known fact that a view of internal diversity and conflict within the "multiversity" was put forth shortly before with great clarity and insight by President Clark Kerr in his book, The Uses of the University. [Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964.]

The FSM leaders, by contrast, used such a view of the university's internal dynamics as a major intellectual tool in their conflict with the administration.

From one standpoint, this was just good strategy: divide and conquer. But it was more than this -- they were able to draw blood with their analysis. When they quoted President Kerr's book at their rallies and in their mimeographed leaflets, the force of his logic and insight made many of the points they sought to underline. They were able to marshal a consciousness of common interest among their fellow students as it differed from the interests of the specialized professor in his laboratory and the administrator who must mediate among power-centers. They were also able, by their own accounts, to use their understanding of university social structure for rough predictions of administrative actions at critical points.

Again, let it be clear that I am not talking here about an oversimplified Marxian "class conflict" theory of the inevitable downfall of capitalistic social organization. In fact, the main intellectual father of analysis such as I am discussing was Max Weber, whose entire work has been called a reply to Marx, and who saw neither capitalism nor socialism but bureaucracy as the major problem of modern political society. [See Seymour M. Lipset, Political Man, Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday Anchor, 1963, p. 11, and references cited.]

As several persons have remarked independently, the Berkeley events repeatedly assumed the disturbing character of a Greek tragedy, with each group acting out assigned roles to what seemed an inexorable and destructive conclusion. For long weeks, each group faithfully portrayed its organizational stereotype: administrators seemed to act like bureaucrats, faculty members like bewildered and well-meaning bystanders, students like idealistic and intransigent rebels. Even the campus policemen acted like their own impersonal, deadpanned caricatures. Anyone who has ever seen Sophocles' Antigone could scarcely escape the dramatic parallel.

But my point is not a literary one. I am not suggesting that we emphasize only the strains that divide us, or merely find dramatic meaning in gossip about them, or rest content with the constraining effects of our institutional roles. Rather, I suggest that we must recognize these problems for what they are and discuss them openly, if we are to avoid their dehumanizing effects on our perspectives and behavior. A pretense that all is unity and reason in academe, except for a few intransigent youngsters who want to introduce politics, may be understandable in the heat of conflict, when a common front is being mounted against hysterical pressures from without. But it makes no sense as an analytical posture, once the immediate threat is past.

Perhaps I have belabored that point enough for now. But there are several related ideas that should be mentioned briefly.

An organization in society. Along with its internal conflicts, the university's relations with groups in the outside society were emphasized in the rhetoric of the FSM. As suggested previously, they accused administrators and regents of pandering to community pressures attempting to stifle student political expression on campus. University officials refused to concede that such pressures affected their decisions, all the while warning students that their civil disobedience invited more formal intervention in university affairs by outside forces.

In this case, again, it seems that exigencies of the situation led the administration into a most awkward and unfortunate intellectual position. Not only President Kerr but other commentators as well -- in universities, in government, and in independent research organizations -- have pointed for years to the hazards and temptations inherent in the university's growing interdependence with society. [E.g., Homer Babbidge, The Federal Interest in Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962; Harold Orlans, The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1962; Logan Wilson, "The College or University in Its Environment: External Constraints," in The Study of Academic Administration, Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963, and references cited.]

The issue of whether the university can be "a beacon not a mirror" to society, in Robert Hutchins' words, is very much alive. And anyone who has ever worked in public university administration for long knows it as a truism that "political" relations with legislators, other government officials, and influential community leaders are part and parcel of everyday life for the university executive. This does not mean that he is a man without principle, a receiver of bribes, or an amoral salesman of university services; the relations usually are much more subtle and indirect than that. But to deny, on the other hand, that political pressures influence decisions about internal administrative matters, especially in controversial areas such as mass public lawbreaking by university students, is to cast our discussion free from reality.

Thus it was clear to all concerned in Berkeley that the official statements ignored discussion of political relations for good reason, and that the students were quite correct in their general assertions about the university in its relations with society.

Precisely what influences were felt or acted upon, and what their effects were on university policy determinations, are of course much more complex matters -- and much more difficult to get information about. But the idea suggested by some sincere administrators, that university officials merely "reason together" and "weigh values" in a political and social vacuum, really deserves to be discarded for more candid and persuasive formulations. Especially is this so when dealing with intelligent students who have many reasons to know better, and who are suspicious of the motives which may lie behind any official double-talk.

An organization in history. If the university is an organization with a complex internal structure, with its own dynamic politics and intense relations to society, it is also an organization in history. Its enviroing conditions, its goals and functions, the traits of its clients and the demands of its constituents all are changing -- some of them quite rapidly. Society's very recognition of the university's importance has changed its climate of support, making much more generous funds available for certain functions but ignoring others, and requiring much more careful accountability for its expenditure of public funds. Requests by government and industry for consultation with university experts has increased; so have demands for business-like "efficiency" of operation, and for the education of ever-growing numbers of young people. Universities have tried to meet these new demands by expanding the scale of every part of their operations--keeping the over-all form essentially intact, but adding buildings, campuses, professorships, larger classes, teaching assistants, cost accountants, staff coordinators, specialized administrative staff -- all under the same umbrella of elaborated bureaucratic control.

In the view of today's student activists, the universities have neglected to ask what this gigantism might do to their proclaimed basic function -- education of the young. And they have neglected to notice that the young have changed; for one thing, they are not so young any more. At many universities, an actual majority of the students is over 21 years of age. They are accustomed to bearing responsibilities and to making personal decisions as adults to a degree that makes university parental rules seem ridiculous to them. Their own parents no longer exercise such control, or demand such conformity to the blandest standards of public etiquette, as does alma mater. The concern with social and political issues which is characteristic of some of our ablest young minds today is too well-known to need more comment.

Moreover, among many of the most thoughtful students today there is an acute awareness of living



in history. Knowledge of the bomb and its possible imminent use has been much remarked; it has real meaning for these young people. They see themselves, and all men, as being in a condition of continual existential choice, in which they must but also can take responsibility for their acts. For them, the impact of human choice on other humans is inescapable, and so is its moral import. They see inaction in the face of injustice as action in the fullest sense.

But they believe that men can jointly determine their common course, if they face up to the necessities of joint action and individual responsibility. This is the other side of their acute sensitivity to role-determination in behavior; they see human freedom as historical contingency. Many of them are remarkably optimistic about human capacities for harmonious action -- but only if ideals are taken seriously and honest, "authentic" personal relations are held sacred. They do feel strongly about what they see as adult hypocrisy, which allows those in power to keep things static and to retain their positional advantage for the moment, while undercutting the discussion of more fundamental and long-range problems.

The large organization as "private government." There is yet another intellectual stream, this one in both legal and social analysis, with which the FSM leaders and their fellows have made contact. It is the tradition that views large and complex organizations, so typical of modern society, as "private governments." [See, for example, Charles E. Merriam, Public and Private Government, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944; Robert L. Hale, Freedom Through Law, New York: Columbia University Press, 1952; Arthur S. Miller, Private Governments and the Constitution, Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1959.]

These great corporate structures at once exercise considerable, relatively inflexible power over their members, and also carry great weight in the basic economic and political decisions of the "public government" itself. They bring us great advantages as well, being our main social vehicles for the special tasks and functions of the society, such as the production of consumer goods, the conduct of research, the education of the young.

Because of their great power over individual lives, however, and their centrally controlled, hierarchic structures of authority, they raise difficult problems of how to keep their power within reasonable restraints, so that human values other than economic ones may be protected. For example, the management



discretion needed to see that tasks are efficiently performed conflicts with the need to protect individuals from arbitrary dismissal and starchamber adjudication; this is a real dilemma, and cannot be avoided. And the importance of such protection becomes greater as the public and private spheres of society become more intertwined, and as more and more people are subject to the control of large organizations throughout greater areas and proportions of their lives.

The large university of today falls into this area of concern in several ways. As public agencies or quasi-public trusts, universities may be thought to come under the legal doctrine of "state action," which requires that all acts taken by or on behalf of the government be subject to Constitutional standards of due process. As higher education becomes increasingly vital to the economic and social opportunities of individuals, the case is strengthened for protecting its enjoyment as a right. And as the scale of universities increases, the parental analogy of student discipline becomes far less reasonable than a model patterned after more formalized, less personal legal relations.

These problems raise difficult issues for any task-oriented group, perhaps especially for the university. Again, there is no simple solution to them -- but neither can they be ignored. As before, I am not suggesting that the students of the Free Speech Movement had thought these matters out in detail -- although, as you know, national student groups have been exploring such issues explicitly for several years. [Martin Levine, "Private Government on the Campus -- Judicial Review of University Expulsions," Yale Law Journal, vol. 72, no. 7 (June, 1963), pp. 1362-1410.] But the FSM protests were informed by these issues, and a number of the relevant points were explicitly made in their leaflets and at their public rallies.

#### "Student Personnel" Work in the Multiversity

Finally, let me say just a few things about deans of students in relation to these issues. I feel that I can do this with some skill because, since I am not a dean of students myself, I am an expert on his problems. My record is not unsullied in this regard, since I did work with young people some years ago as head resident of an undergraduate dormitory and as a university admissions counselor. But I will try to be objective and impersonal about it, anyway. And I will use the term "dean of students" not for any specific person but generically, for all those who work in what I learn is now called by the telling phrase "student personnel administration."

Professional in a bureaucracy. Like many others in the modern university, the dean of students works in a bureaucratic setting but considers himself in important ways a professional. As a bureaucrat he is, gladly or reluctantly, a member of an administrative "team." He is formally responsible to a superior in the administrative hierarchy, and is duty-bound to represent the best interests of the organization, as those interests are defined by its controlling authorities. As one dean recently put it: "After all, we work here." (It might be added, as one social scientist has done, that this country has no "tradition of resignation" among public servants, in universities or other parts of government.)

As an aspiring professional, on the other hand, the dean of students is devoted to acquiring and developing a body of specialized knowledge, and to using this knowledge for service to individuals. Ideally this means what have been called the "helping and caring" relationships with students. Professional decisions which meet this ideal are made with the student's own best interests foremost in the professional's mind. People who enter work with students usually have, I believe, a genuine concern for individual human beings and their welfare. They do not really see the students as "personnel," at least at the start. Thus you who work with students professionally may typically find yourselves the campus's main "carriers" of values emphasizing individuality, diversity, and personal fulfillment for students -- especially as university faculties become more distant and preoccupied with their research interests.

But the duties of the bureaucrat and the ideals of the "helping and caring" professional cannot always be reconciled, because individual and organizational interests are seldom in perfect harmony. When they do conflict, one or the other must be sacrificed to some degree, and the dean of students often must either make or enforce that decision. Thus the dean of students is the bureaucrat who is on the firing line in any battle with students protesting real or imagined grievances -- although we are all happy to note that the position of target increasingly is shared by presidents, chancellors, and others who traditionally have been exempt.

Routinized "caring"? This is hard work, by any account. You people work where the strong emotions are, work with the real "troublemakers," with the recurrent dilemmas of youth testing the limits of authority, with the petty small problems as well as the large. No one need pretend that this is not emotionally and spiritually wearing. The dean of students either earns

his pay by the seat of his soul, as it were, or he develops callouses there to avoid being rubbed too raw. For this reason, the effort to routinize compassion and to institutionalize genuine caring for individuals within the bureaucratic setting is very difficult -- perhaps impossible. It seems probable that "caring" cannot really be institutionalized at all; we can only establish forms and settings for human relations that encourage or impede it. And the mass processing of classes and categories of students as "personnel," to be dealt with under the rules, most certainly is an impediment to caring about them -- or even knowing them -- as individuals.

Some deans may come to like the role of bureaucrat so well that they give up professional aspirations and values altogether. Or the firing line may be delegated to another specialist, whose "profession" is rule-enforcement as such -- for example, the campus policeman recently appointed at Berkeley as an assistant dean of students. (Of course, he soon became known affectionately by the students as "Dean Fuzz.") But the dilemma is not resolved by seizing that horn.

"Rehabilitation" and paternalism. Another problem of the university's relations with politically alert and active students inheres in the very "helping" orientation that characterizes the student personnel administrator. This orientation conduces to the view that deans of students are experts of a modest sort in human relations -- that their job is to "teach" students how to become "mature" participants in society. Usually, today, the secular university dean is not a religious leader or openly a teacher of morals; he is a well-educated adult, often with some psychological training, usually with some skill in personal relations, and with what one dean has called "a belief in human rehabilitation." Because of these qualifications, apparently, in matters concerning students, the dean knows best.

With very small children, and with many college students on many issues, one can adopt this fatherly pose and believe in it sincerely. It is clear to all who will see that many students do need personal guidance, perhaps some intellectual tutelage about freedom and authority, and gentle but firm persuasion that it is more "mature" to do things the official way. But with some students, and with issues involving strong moral and political convictions, it simply is not that easy.

As I have noted, many university students today have reached not only the soldiering age but the voting age as well. Some have experience of moral

and political arenas -- such as the racial cauldron of the Southern streets -- that most of us polite, intellectual faculty members and deans may never have. They are very idealistic, perhaps overly so. But that is hard to prove -- especially when they have recently forced us to take our own professed ideals more seriously, and we have found that suddenly it can be done.

Similarly, it is not easy to show that the dean "knows" it is best for students to forego civil disobedience, and to curtail campus political expression, if that means cutting back their very effective action on behalf of racial equality. If students wish to risk arrest, conviction, and prison to continue such "overly idealistic" action, we may think it unwise, and advise strongly against it. But it is by no means clear that they have chosen wrongly for themselves -- or, indeed, for the university and the society. And it is intriguing to guess how one could demonstrate that the students at Stanford and Chicago would have been better advised to avoid civil disobedience concerning the Selective Service tests, if it held even some slight possibility of affecting their dying in Vietnam.

In such decisions, where there is no clear criterion of "maturity," and human interests inescapably conflict, the posture of paternal advice and of kindly rehabilitation for the misguided young will not serve us. Instead, it carries the danger that it can serve as an all-purpose stamp of benevolence for our decisions as administrators, disguising the real conflicts of interest that are being arbitrated.

Thus the perspective of personality psychology, like the sociological analysis of interests based on social position (which I have emphasized in this paper) can be both used and abused. Both are important analytic tools for understanding the behavior of others -- and our own behavior as well. But such analyses, and the persuasive skills of the "human relations" expert, are no keys to benevolent paternalism. They, too, can become the tools of human manipulation. Thus, in the same way that we, as administrators, are biased observers of the justice and reasonableness in our decisions, so as the official helpers and rehabilitators we may misread students' passionate moral conviction, seeing in it only the compulsive response of an adolescent personality. It may even be difficult for us to agree that there is a difference.

These difficulties cannot be avoided altogether; they can only be guarded against. One promising way, it seems to me, lies in the continuing seminars on freedom and control which Dean Williamson has

suggested each campus should have. When Dean Williamson suggested this idea again at the WICHE institute in Berkeley last summer, the FSM leaders with whom I was sitting thought it was an excellent one. It is clear this was in part because they believed they would teach the good dean a thing or two in such a seminar. But that is just the point. Even such seminars can be manipulated -- by demagogic filibuster or by skillful "guiding" of the discussion. However, to the extent that the seminar ideal is attained, everyone present takes the risk inherent in any dialog: They may be persuaded, may learn something from the others. That is a risk we all should be willing to take on any subject, and especially on matters of freedom and control in today's large organizations. The last word on that subject emphatically has not been said.

What I am going to do is stop at this point, trying to just make clear that while this is kind of a gloomy thesis that I have suggested, with which many of you may want to take exception, and I guess that you would, it is gloomy in the sense of what I mentioned about the unanticipated consequences, that our social arrangements kind of have us in their grip.

In one sense I think it is quite clearly true what the student told the lady who spoke, "You are on the wrong road; just quit." We have to change our social arrangements, I believe, somewhat. Now the question of how to do that does not mean turning them over to the students. I am pretty sure it means making them less authoritarian and finding restraints for our discretion and learning that we can do our jobs within it.

I ask that you not reject the students in the simple way of being able to find a sufficient explanation in their psychological makeup or their social positions, and try to understand the content of it, because they have shown us in some cases (Berkeley was of course the great outstanding one) that when they massed social power behind their ideas it suddenly became clear that they had ideas, and when we listened there was something there to be said. And when they said, "You can do things differently and it won't hurt that much," we said, "No we can't. It is the only way it can be." And they said, "All right, we'll push you." And we said, "Okay, we're going to get you for that." They said, "Okay, you're going to get us. We're going to have to push you because we believe in it." And they pushed, and we changed, and we didn't hurt that much.

That is not the case that will happen everywhere, and it is a one-sided view, and it is exagger-

ated, if you like, for emphasis, but I suggest to you that what I have been saying today has a kind of unreality about it because it is alien to your way of thinking about things, and it does not coincide with your personal subjective experience at the university. Do not reject out of hand as a propaganda trick, or some Marxist ideology, and so on, the idea that it is very close to the genuine, rather mature experience of many, many people, and there is a scholarly tradition of a non-revolutionary sort that is very strongly behind many parts of it. I tried to suggest some of the ways in which that was true.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN BLOLAND: Thank you very much, Terry, for your insightful look at the phenomenon from the perspective of a year.

We do not have time for questions this morning, but Terry has agreed to lead a seminar on this same subject this afternoon from two to four, in the Colonial Room. Those of you who have questions or opposing points of view, or speeches that you would like to make at that time, this would be the time to do it.

Mr. Emmet, any last minute details?

... Conference announcements ...

... The Fifth General Session recessed at twelve-ten o'clock ...

CONFERENCE LUNCHEON SESSION  
Tuesday - June 28, 1966

The Conference Luncheon Session, held in the Spanish Ballroom, convened at twelve-thirty o'clock, Dean Donald M. DuShane, Dean of Students, University of Oregon, presiding.

CHAIRMAN DuSHANE: It is now ten minutes after the time we are supposed to begin, and President Nygreen has been quite insistent on starting things on time, so let us get under way here for this luncheon session.

The invocation will be given by Rabbi Arthur Jacobovitz, Director of Hillel Foundation at the University of Washington, and member of the faculty at Seattle University.

RABBI ARTHUR JACOBVITZ (Hillel Foundation, University of Washington): O Heavenly Father, we invoke Thy blessings of divine sense and goodness upon the men and women assembled here today, who as deans of students dedicate their lives to the sacred task of aiding students in their quest for meaning and identity and knowledge and scholarship.

We pray Thee, O God, grant strength of mind and body, courage and understanding to all who help further the goals and purposes of students so that together we may ever acknowledge and accept our responsibilities in advancing the sacred cause of our endeavors.

We acknowledge the privilege which is ours today, to come together as people who are bound to one another with bonds more enduring and more meaningful than the accidental ties of common descent. We are united by the love we share for the noble heritage of our forefathers. We are drawn together by the concern we share for the spiritual, psychological and academic health of our children. We are bound to each other by the resolve we share to make the rich inheritance of Sinai and Olympus the treasured inheritance of our children.

We are therefore united by the loyalty we share to our institutions of higher education. As we assemble today to mark the observance of a conference dedicated to knowledge, wisdom, and understanding, we pray that our minds be opened to comprehend Thy truths, that our hearts be entwined to appreciate the spiritual values basic to human happiness. Incline our hearts to bring into our professional lives a sense of integrity and ethical application. Thus will we also strengthen the moral fiber of our academic community.

Heavenly Father, give us the strength to be men of stature so that we may have the courage to voice our dissent when we honestly disagree with the majority, so that we may teach when we have something worthy to say, so that we may lead when we have the vision of honorable goals, ultimately not only to help the student to find himself but to give him aid and direction in the quest for creating a better world by reconstructing society. Amen.

CHAIRMAN DuSHANE: To allay your curiosity, in case this is necessary, I would like to introduce to you the members of the Conference who are at the head table.

We are under good auspices this afternoon because we have present a Rabbi who is a professor at a Catholic University; we have the present President, soon to be Past President; the present President-Designate, and the future President-Designate, all taking care of Miss Tyler and me.

At my far right is the new President-Designate, Carl Knox. At my immediate left, the soon to be Past President, Glen Nygreen, and on the far left, the President who will be in charge of the Cincinnati meeting next year, Ed Williamson. Thank you. (Applause)

... Luncheon was served ...

CHAIRMAN DuSHANE: It is a privilege, and a privilege I am very proud to have this afternoon, to introduce to you a student, teacher, counselor, writer, and scholar who was for many years a member of my own staff at the University of Oregon, Miss Leona Tyler.

She was born in Wisconsin, and grew up in Hibbing and Virginia, Minnesota. She was educated from the baccalaureate, and through the Master's and the Doctorate, Ph.D., at the University of Minnesota, shifting in the process from English to psychology.

Her professional experience began as a high school teacher in Minnesota, and Muskegon Heights, Michigan. Then she was a graduate assistant at Michigan, instructor at the University of Oregon, and successively an assistant professor, an associate professor, and professor of psychology at the University of Oregon.

In 1947 or '48, she decided that although she was at that time the first director of the University Counseling Center, she decided that she did not want to be an administrator, and she forsook that job, turning it over to Spence Carlson, whom many of you



know, who has had it ever since, and went back to teaching, learning, writing, and continuing as a part time member of our Counseling Center staff in counseling.

Some years later, however, she reconsidered this anti-administrative bias and consented to become Dean of the University of Oregon's Graduate School. She is not the first woman dean of a Graduate School, I understand, but only the second, by a year or so. But that is all right, because she always tries her hardest anyway. (Laughter)

She has held visiting professorships at Berkeley in 1957-58, University of Amsterdam 1962-63, and her professional activities include serving as President of the Division of Counseling Psychology and member of the Board of Directors and a fellow for the American Psychological Association, Secretary and President of the Western Psychological Association, President of the Oregon Psychological Association, member of the Finance Committee currently for the American Personnel and Guidance Association, a fellow for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and holds a diplomate in counseling, and until this year has been consulting editor for the Personnel and Guidance Journal, and Associate Editor for the Association of Counseling Psychology.

I have here three pages, which lists seven books, including -- well, it would be nine if we took revisions -- and some twenty-five articles, a substantial number of which have been in recent years, so that she has continued to be a productive scholar.

This morning Dick Hulet lamented the passing of some of the story telling opportunities we had in past meetings, and I recalled one that I always liked that Shorty Nowotny told years ago, about a speech that was like a Texas Longhorn steer -- the points were far apart, and there was a lot of bull in between. (Laughter)

Now with Dean Tyler, I am sure that her -- I have checked this carefully and her environment has been Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and Oregon, and the Netherlands. She has never been anywhere near Texas in any professional capacity, so I am sure you are not going to hear that kind of a Texas speech today. Dean Tyler. (Applause)

DEAN LEONA TYLER (Dean of the Graduate School, Professor of Psychology, University of Oregon): Thank you very much. The trouble with that kind of introduction is that it makes you tired before

you start. (Laughter) Seeing all those things laid  
ene to end, as it were.

I was thinking, too, as he was telling about  
these places that I taught for a year or so, that it  
seems almost as though about three or four years after  
I leave a place they begin to have student unrest.  
(Laughter) Berkeley was very quiet the year I was  
there. Nobody rebelled about anything. Well, it did  
not stay that way.

Amsterdam was a very peaceful place the  
year that I was there, '62 and '63, but some of you  
saw on television, I think, the kind of student riots  
they have been having there this year. Students  
milling through the streets in support of a strike  
of dock workers, or something.

So I need to give that a little thought,  
just what that means (laughter), how long a time needs  
to pass before you stop taking responsibility for  
something. (Laughter)

Anyway, the topic that was assigned to me  
today -- I think it was assigned -- is:

"The Student Personnel Administrator  
as a Counselor of Students -- Some  
Role Reconsiderations"

This topic turned out to be a very useful kind of an  
assignment because it furnished an occasion for going  
over my own experience in this area, going back some  
thirty years now.

I came into the student personnel field at  
what I think most people would consider to be one of  
the really exciting periods, where this whole idea of  
the counseling role being central, I think, got started.

If the luncheon had gone on a little longer,  
I might have gotten these historical points straight-  
ened out a little by talking to Ed Williamson. But I  
know that Minnesota, in the 1930s when I took my work  
there in psychology and counseling, was a very excit-  
ing place, and there were lots of ideas getting  
started.

Of course, the persons involved, many of  
them are known to you, and I think probably the cen-  
tral figure was a person who was my adviser, and I  
think he was the adviser of a good many other people,  
Donald G. Patterson, and there was Ed Williamson,  
John G. Darley, and Gilbert Wrenn, and a good many  
other people with ideas and a kind of a vision of

what could be done in large, public educational institutions.

The central idea for me out of all this was that student personnel work can be a means for individualizing mass education; that we were entering a period when a great many people were coming to college, people from all sorts of backgrounds, people with all kinds of motives and aims for themselves. We were trying to do this educational task on a large scale, to educate a lot of people, but that if student personnel work could do what it appeared that it might do, we could have, in a sense, an individualized sort of education for each person in this mass, and that that was the essential task, to see that out of the resources, these large resources that were available in the modern educational institution, that each individual got the sort of attention that he needed, just the kind of education that was right for him. Student personnel work as I saw it at the time was a way of setting up the arrangements, the organizational structures, the organization that we have been talking about, through which this could be accomplished.

Then it was also a way of making the process of individualizing education available through counseling. And what counseling meant to me, and what I think it has continued to be -- the essential meaning all the way through my contact with it -- is that it is the process through which this individualization of what would otherwise be mass education, is accomplished.

For people who are studying psychology, counseling, personnel work -- I am thinking about education in Minnesota in the 1930s -- counseling was a very broad concept, and included more than I think it came to include later on. It included, for instance, the whole idea of tests of achievement, and aptitude, and interest, because these were part of this individualizing process, finding out what a person's own personal resources were, so that he would know himself what he needed and what he wanted.

It included a good deal of cerebration on the part of the counselor, synthesizing a lot of information, putting things together, trying to understand a person, trying to see him as a unique individual, and put himself in his place and see what he needed out of education.

As time passed, during the 1940s and 1950s the changes occurred in the concept of counseling, and when we think of role reconsiderations, when we think of whether counseling is an appropriate role to have as our central focus for student personnel work, we

have to consider, we have to clarify what we mean by counseling.

The thing that I began to think was true, as I was thinking about this, in preparation for this talk, was that counseling as it was seen at Minnesota in the 1930s does not need to be reformulated really as a central role. It is still a sort of the essential of personnel work. But counseling as the term has been used by many people in many settings since is a good deal less appropriate. What has happened -- if you will pardon sort of an ugly coined word -- is an increasing therapization of counseling during this period during and after World War II.

Counselors came to think of their work more and more in a kind of mental health setting, as helping students and others with whom they worked toward normality and adjustment. We could go into the reasons why that change occurred, I think in some detail, if we wanted to. The prestige that psychiatry had, or came to have during and after World War II, and the fact that psychologists who had been working with psychiatrists naturally found it more -- well in this almost unconscious search for prestige, wanted to do what psychiatrists were doing, and all other kinds of counselors wanted to do what psychologists were doing.

I think that a lot of other things changed along with this, without people really realizing they were changing.

I think probably another factual thing that brought about this sort of change was the linking of these two terms in Roger's first book that came out in 1941, "Counseling and Psychotherapy," and using the two terms interchangeably.

There undoubtedly are other reasons, but a lot of things changed with it, so that we were not really aware that a change in the word itself, the meaning it was carrying, was going on. For instance, the word "problem" -- counselors have always talked about problems, but as I remember, the way in which the word problem was originally used in connection with counseling, it was used in somewhat the way a designer, or inventor, or mathematician used the word. A problem is a situation that a person faces to which he must find a solution; whereas increasingly it came to mean to be interested in the psychiatrist's test, a problem child, problem behavior, as being unsatisfactory behavior, unsatisfactory attitudes, and so on.

Maturity is another word that has been bandied around a great deal in the psychological profes-

sions. It came to be used almost as a synonym for adjustment, or even conformity.

Then, too, I think there were accompanying changes in our clientele. I am sure this has happened many places in counseling centers. As counselors became more interested in people with personality difficulties, the word gets around that people with personality difficulties are the ones who go to the counseling center, and so increasingly people who do not have personality difficulties, or who do not want to recognize that they have personality difficulties stay away.

Then when surveys are made, statistics are taken, it shows that the people who come to counseling centers have personality difficulties. So the accompanying changes that go along with one another can change the whole connotation of a word in service, without people being very much aware that such a change is occurring.

When I became aware, perhaps ten years or so ago, that this kind of shift had occurred and was occurring, well, I did not like it, and I still do not like it. What it involves is a kind of tacit assumption that most people are normal, that some people have problems or neuroses, or maladjustments, or personality difficulties, or whatever you want to call them, and that only the ones who are having trouble need help. It is this that is an unsatisfactory basis for student personnel work, I think. Our task is to help everybody, in the way they need help. And the way of formulating it that suggests that normal people get along all right, and only those who are not normal have difficulty, and whose are the ones with whom we work, turns out to be wrong.

I was relating this to what Mr. Lunsford was saying about the Berkeley situation, and his objection to people, psychologists, who talk about alienating students as though this was a symptom of something, a symptom of some maladjustment, and the way in which he was trying to break through that to make people look at the attitudes for what they were, rather than as some kind of a new psychiatric category.

The student personnel administrator then, the first thing I would like to say, is that I think he is a counselor in the 1935 sense, but not in the 1950 or 1955 sense of the term; a counselor, but not primarily a therapist.

However, this puts it on too verbal a basis. I really do not care what term one uses, and I would

like to direct most of my attention to what I think the task itself is. It may be that already counselor and therapist have become so synonymous that there is no point in fighting for the word. Some psychologists are going over to the term "human effectiveness" as a specialty within psychology, which I think is rather a useful phrase. The thing that someone ought to be dealing with -- probably we ought to be dealing with -- is the promotion of human effectiveness.

Anyway, this task of developing each person's unique individuality through education is, I think, the essential student personnel task, and the student personnel administrator's job still is to create and maintain the settings, and the services, the organizational framework within which this kind of development can occur. And then to carry out the actual dialog with the student which enables him to make use of these things himself.

However, it is not simply a matter of returning to the 1930s. A lot of things have happened since then. We know a great deal more than we knew then, and some of the ideas, the things that seemed most important then, in carrying out this task, in setting up this central structure, do not look so promising any longer.

So I think we need to re-think it, keeping this core of what we are trying to do, and then think what we now have that we can bring to bear on this that will enable us to do it better.

In doing this kind of thinking about it, about the problems related to this, the one concept that has been most useful to me, that made it possible to clear up some of these other areas, is the concept of what I think of as possibilities.

Now what that means is that I became convinced that there is a step in human functioning that most psychologists were ignoring -- particularly during this period when they have been devoted to a stimulus response kind of paradigm for all human action.

Before the stimulus in a sense, and before there can be any response to it, there is a selection of what is to be a stimulus for the person. The person, out of an immense, vast confusing multiplicity of energies that are being brought to bear on him, reacts to something, and the selection of what is to be the stimulus to which reaction occurs came to occupy for me the center of the stage when I was thinking about what makes one individual different from another, and

how do we differ individuality in people, because that individuality is to a large extent a matter of what he selects out of the surroundings that are all around him.

We are seeing an emphasis on that kind of thing now. Throughout psychology, the emphasis is on work with perception on the selectivity of the process, on the fact that perception is a process that enables the person to react to a small fraction of what is out before him, rather than to the whole thing. We see it in personality theory, in theories like that of George Kelley, the concept of personal, or the idea of personal constructs that are individual ways of organizing experience, so that you are prepared to react to the experience that comes to you.

The reason I think this is so important, and I am so sure of this, and I have been sure of this for several years now -- most ideas I have had, I have not clung to that long, but the reason this seems to be a rather durable one is that it does seem to rest on what I think is the basic fact of human existence, and that modern man has not always wanted to recognize, the fact of human finiteness.

We can talk about man as a species, but man as an individual, the human individual, lasts only a few years really, and he has only a certain amount of time at his disposal. He must select. He does not have to do it consciously, and he does not have to do it wisely, but what goes into his life must be selected out of a lot of things that might have gone into it. Every person might have been lots of things that he is not now. There are many directions of development that were closed out by the thing that he did. And it is this fact, that life at any point is a matter of a lot of possibilities only a few of which can ever be made into actualities, that gives the task of what I would like to think of as counseling its firmest grounding.

It seems to me that this fact of possibilities and the importance of selecting among them, is more crucial now than it was in previous periods in history. As human society becomes more affluent, more interconnected with people living in cities where all sorts of kinds of life are displayed before the individual, more mobile, more literate, all of these changes that we are seeing in society have the effect of bringing a lot more possibilities before each individual than he would have been brought up against in previous times.

Furthermore, they are confronting him with the necessity of doing something about them himself,

to a far larger extent than used to be the case. There was a time when nobody expected the average boy to choose a career. He didn't really have any necessity for choice. When he got to be the right age, he just went to work, and there was a job there, and he got into it.

There was a time when choosing a husband or a wife was not much of a problem. Either the family did it for the individual, or the family so carefully steered him or her into the right social circles that when the time came, whether the person was active or passive about it, the thing just happened.

There was a time when a person never thought of choosing his religion or his values. A Catholic who grew up a Catholic was a Catholic, a Protestant was a Protestant, a Jew was a Jew, and so on. But we have reached the place where a person cannot insulate himself from the other ideas, not only a person who goes to a large university -- suppose he is a Catholic, he meets up with not only Protestants and Jews but with very articulate representatives of Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism. He has to consider all these things. And what would have happened in previous times happens now through his own choice now.

I think that is perhaps one of the reasons why there is this student alienation. Students talk about having no values and values not being provided for them. Well, they are not going to be provided in the future. They are going to have to locate their own. They are going to have to survey the possibilities and choose the ones they want.

We are the people who are going to have to make them aware that this is necessary. That is why we have this concern with identities these days. An identity is not going to be given anybody in our kind of society. A person is going to have to build his own, and there are all sorts of materials, but he cannot put them all in. He has to pick out the ones that he wants to build it out of, and it is not easy.

I think that is why we have the concern in our time over public issues, over foreign policy, over civil rights, and things like this, because young people are becoming aware that these are not facts of nature, that there are lots of possible ways in which the United States could run its relationships with Asian countries, or in which we could organize our society within our own country, and that somebody is making these decisions, and that we do have some responsibility to try to effect the choices on which our own common life rests.



Our major responsibility then is to help students carry out this process of choosing where, as educated people, as representatives of educational institutions, we are committed to the theory that awareness is a good thing. This could be argued, I am sure, this point that it is possible for people to go ahead, sort of spontaneously and unconsciously and make choices on that basis. But I think that most of us, almost without question, would think it is better for a person to have some idea of what he is doing, to do this with his eyes open, as it were.

Then, what this has done to this 1930 idea of counseling, the idea current during the 1930s, which was to a large extent based on career choice, is to broaden this whole idea of choice of careers to include a lot of other things.

There is a real possibility that choice of career might not be a very important choice in the future. Even now guaranteed national income is being advocated very strongly by some groups. But the choice of a way to live is something that cannot be avoided, and the thing is that it is not something that is going to take care of itself in normal people, and just have to be helped along a little bit in the weaklings or the maladjusted. It is something that confronts everybody and we are going to have to find some way of helping everybody do it.

What this will require is, first of all, an opportunity for verbal counseling, talking these things over, thinking out loud about them, until one can set his own ideas straight. But I think it will require a lot of other things, perhaps some of them which we have not even thought about yet.

One way in which young people have always done this is through bull sessions, and we probably need to think of as many variations as we can on this bull session theme, to think of as many ways as we can that would bring people with different ideas together to talk about things that are important to them, and the things that are of long range importance.

What we are seeing in these student movements of our time, I think, also is an insistence of students that they are not satisfied with verbal methods alone. They want to try out some of these ways to live, to try out some of the possibilities of life before they really commit themselves to certain ones. In general, that is a good thing. But I think it faces student personnel administrators probably, and other workers, with one of the most difficult problems, and I do not know exactly what the solution

is, because there are some great risks in try-outs, and there are probably some ways of living that carry such serious risks that we should not permit people to try it. We should be setting limits within which these try-outs occur.

This idea of setting limits is an idea that has been much discussed in counseling and therapy. I encountered it first in thinking about children's therapy, the idea that you must hold their behavior within certain bounds and allow them freedom within those limits.

Probably this current concern over doing something about the use of drugs on the campus can be understood within this framework. Here is something-- the risk of addiction is the kind of risk that probably is too great. We should not allow people to run it if we can help it. The risk of a combination of alcohol and fast cars is probably just as -- well, it is a very dangerous thing. Every weekend the papers are full of names of 18-year olds who have been killed in accidents Friday night, and Saturday night, and so on.

The trouble with setting limits about some of these things, which are really very dangerous, is that we cannot make them stick. And we have to consider that too. There is that aspect of it. It does very little good to prohibit something that you cannot -- set up a rule you cannot enforce.

But I do not think that excuses us from thinking about them. I think some of the limit setting can well be done by means of student codes. The University of Oregon has gone over, as far as discipline is concerned, for the last couple of years and has been working under a student formulated code, a system of student courts under the jurisdiction of a faculty-student committee. This is probably one kind of way of handling this limit problem. We can perhaps work it out.

I think also that we need to be honest about what we are doing. I think we can stand on the conviction that it is somebody's job around the university to set up the rules that define the limits, and we probably will have to take some of that responsibility. But I think we need to be honest also about the fact that not all rules have that function. There a lot of things that are against the rules that are not dangerous, and where the rule or regulation would not be set up to protect the students who are trying out ways to live, but set up for some other reason. I think there is no reason why we cannot be a lot more candid with students about things like that than we have been.

Another thing that protects us there, I think, is the fact that these external pressures are different from one institution to another, and consequently the limits to what is permitted or condoned are different from one institution to another.

With research centers, like the Center for Research on Higher Education at Berkeley, and some of the other places that are doing work of that sort, we are finding out more and more about what the character of some of these different colleges is, so that I think the student who wants to try out some things that our campus does not permit, will sometime perhaps be able to move to some place that does, and will be able to have the information that he needs in order to help him do that.

I do not know that it would necessarily make us popular to say, "We don't allow that, but why don't you go to Reed" (laughter) or San Jose, or somewhere. (Laughter) But at least this would be honest too.

I think we must avoid rationalizing. That is another thing in one of Mr. Lunsford's points this morning. We must avoid hypocrisy.

Now in addition to this main task, helping students confront this vast array of possibilities and select wisely, choose what each individual wants for his own life, in addition to doing that, I think it is the other part of a personnel worker's experiences to enable the individual to learn from his own experience. The university and college is the institution which is devoted to learning. Most of it is learning from other people's work, from books, from the thoughts of other people, from laboratory experiments, and so on.

But some of the most important learning out of which strong personalities are built, is learning from what you do, and what happens. In this sense a person can learn from his failures -- perhaps more from his failures than he does from his successes.

It is squarely within our responsibility, I think, to try to set up some kind of a system that would enable each person to learn as much as possible from whatever experiences he encounters. That would include things like exit interviewing for students who are leaving the campus at the administration's request, or it would include a chance for a person who has spent a night in jail to discuss with somebody what he has learned from this experience, if he wants to. It would include a lot of things. This is a thing I think we do not know too much about. We have not really put the emphasis on it that it really

deserves, and I think we could have a lot more research on things like this.

If anything is going to enable the university to promote this kind of learning, I think it is the student personnel division that is going to do it because it is the student personnel worker who is most likely to be in touch with the student in and after each of these crises.

What should a student personnel administrator, or any kind of a student personnel worker be like to handle this sort of a role? How should he be educated, and what should his own advanced training consist of?

Here I think we are a lot less certain than we would have been a decade or two ago. I am inclined to think perhaps we have over-professionalized this business, in the sense of assuming that there are certain techniques, certain skills, certain kinds of esoteric professional information that were necessary. I think it is becoming clearer and clearer that it demands a far greater amount of breadth than we have ever assumed was necessary, that a person to be good at this needs a lot of ideas, a lot of knowledge of humanities past, a lot of sensitivity to the present, and what is going on, a lot of creative imagination directed toward the future; and whatever kind of education -- not just degree education, but continuing education -- leads to this kind of thinking is the thing we want to promote.

Techniques and skills look less important than they used to, I think. At the time I came into this work one of the first things that was considered to be essential for a competent person in our work was a good system of records. We are looking now at records with a very skeptical eye. We are wondering whether a personnel record which includes a lot of information about the person is really a blessing or a curse. And in our computerized society this question becomes more and more urgent.

At the time I came in thirty years ago we thought that tests were really the most hopeful thing on the horizon, that this was the thing that was going to enable us to analyze individuals and help an individual figure out what he really wanted and needed.

We all know the kinds of skepticism that have arisen about tests, and the limitations that we see on their usefulness now. Not that we would get rid of them, but we would place a lot less emphasis on them.

So perhaps we ought to think over again, what do we really want? Fix professional standards for student personnel work, or whether we want to get in a certain kind of person that will have a certain approach to life and a certain kind of relationship with the ones with whom he deals?

Summing up then, I come to the final feeling that role -- talking about our role modifications -- role is not quite the right word. It suggests acting in a certain way, having some skills that you can apply, no matter what happens, because you know you play that role in a situation.

What the times seem to be demanding of us more and more is genuineness, just being the kind of person who can be completely himself, and get away from any sort of role. So that in a way I think I come back to the same point that I started with, the sort of thing that a topic like this stimulated, this reflection on one's own experience, this thinking of what we are doing and why we are doing it.

I think this is the kind of thing that each of us needs, probably more than any clarification of roles. We need, each of us, to think who he is, and what he is doing, and how he is making whatever impact on the world he is making. This is the essential thing.

In the words of the heading of one part of Platt's recent book, "The Step to Man," what we need to emphasize is to be and to become. This is for our constituents, for the students with whom we deal, and for ourselves. That is what it is all about.  
(Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN DuSHANE: I attempted to make a reference to there being no bull, but plenty of meat in this speech, but the cool, clear voice of reason which we have heard makes that too undignified, so I will say instead, "Dean Tyler, stay with it, Babe. You're on the right road." (Laughter and applause)

Tom wanted me to announce that the rosters of those who are in attendance are on the tables outside the door. If you want to know who the names are that belong to these numbers you have seen around here, pick one up on the way out.

We are dismissed.

... The Conference Luncheon Session recessed at one fifty-five o'clock ...

SEMINAR  
Tuesday - June 28, 1966

"The Myth of the Organized University:  
Alienation and Value Confusion"

The In Depth Seminar on "The Myth of the Organized University" met in the Georgian Room, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m., Dean Robert Chick, Dean of Students, Oregon State University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CHICK: Undoubtedly one of the outstanding features of this Conference has been the inclusion of so many resource persons and speakers from outside of our Association. I know that all of us are very grateful to these persons for taking their time to come and meet with us.

As a former student at the University of Denver, I take great pride in introducing a member of that faculty, Dr. Bernard Spilka, who is now Professor of Psychology. His area of emphasis is social psychology. He has done considerable work in psychological measurement and social problems, including religion, prejudice, educational achievement among minority groups, values and personality.

He has published at least fifty articles and he has two books in press right now; one, "Prejudice in America," by Harper and Row; and "Social Problems," McGraw-Hill.

Currently he is President-Elect of the Colorado Psychological Association. He is also President-Elect of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association.

He is going to speak this afternoon to the topic "The Myth of the Organized University; Alienation and Value Confusion." It seems particularly appropriate after our Fifth Session this morning.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Dr. Bernard Spilka. (Applause)

DR. BERNARD SPILKA (Professor of Psychology, University of Denver): You have heard a lot of these flattering introductions during the Conference. What you may not have thought about is that it is a considerable motivator for getting someone to speak. I think half the time they come to hear the introduction. And I will not be an exception in that case.

For the past couple of years my research work has been with Indians and it has been suggested that that makes it appropriate for me to speak to you.

It is also certainly an interesting kind of cross cultural problem working with Indians, but then again, I am stepping out of my field, and I think it may be similarly cross-cultural to speak to people in the student personnel and counseling area, and deans and such. I do not necessarily consider them significantly different from Indians, as far as my relationships are concerned. I am definitely an outsider in this regard. I am used to speaking primarily at psychological meetings where things get, you know, rather formal, so I went through all of the ritual of writing a paper. Then after being here a while, I find out that people seem to go very much more off-the-cuff. Since I have put a lot of time and energy into this, and I am so egocentric about the words I have selected, I hope you will bear with me if I try reading it, and then breaking in every now and then with maybe a song and dance act, or hymn, to sort of break the routine. I think it might help somewhat.

#### THE MYTH OF THE ORGANIZED UNIVERSITY

Not much time has passed since the general image of American Higher Education consisted solely of golden years of football, sorority and fraternity camaraderie, and a pleasant interlude on the way to economic affluence and the "good" life. Happy-go-lucky students seemed to interact surprisingly well with scholarly faculty bookworms and shadow-like university officials were always good as rotary luncheon speakers.

These were false images, but they were reassuring. At least outwardly harmony appeared to prevail, testifying to a passably efficient organization.

Recent years have, however, shattered such reflections. Goldfish swallowing and panty raids have been replaced by protest demonstrations. Almost overnight, universities became sources of popular notoriety. The front page supplanted the sports page and the public became increasingly aware of ferment, if not upheaval, in the halls of academia. Imagine -- students espousing ideals that clash with our compromised values, or their immorality confronting popular hypocrisy, AAUP chapters threatening administrative officials, and claims for freedom extending to the realities beyond commencement addresses.

What is now coming to the fore has been latent in the educational process, but more fundamentally in the nature of American Society itself. In a basic sense these conflicts represent a search for meaning and purpose, for direction and coherence in an institution that would seem to be sadly and badly lacking internal cohesion. Just as contemporary

American society has to face the problem of discrepancies between what it claims to be and what it is often in fact, so now the university must clearly and collectively decide what its role will be.

Many schema have been offered regarding the value base of American Culture. One conceptualization which has proven useful is derived from a survey of writings in this area. This system postulates a dichotomy of our cultural values into two broad patterns, a primary or success-achievement orientation, and a secondary or equalitarian-responsibility complex. [This has been developed by the writer and explicated in greater detail in a forthcoming book.] Elements of each, to some degree, infuse the other, nevertheless each would seem to possess a focus that must result in much individual and institutional strain.

The success-achievement emphasis gains support from sub-values that accentuate individualism, hard work, practicality, efficiency, adaptability, freedom and conformity among other themes.

On the other hand, the equalitarian-responsibility framework is theorized as constituted of community-oriented cultural elements such as humanitarianism, moralism, equality, democracy, and social responsibility.

As is obvious the classical action-dialectic of freedom vs. responsibility or individual vs. community is thus posed for our nation and its institutional components. This, it is felt, in essence, forms the basis of our current educational turmoil. In brief, it is suggested that the various groups which comprise institutions of higher learning subscribe to different of these value-emphases, though conflict within each also exists. This leads to fractionation and deregulation in the university community. As communication breaks down it is likely to be paralleled by increasing perceptions of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, and psychosocial isolation on the part of those in this setting. In other words, a growing anomic state seems to engender a concomitant individual alienation that may well erupt in an explosive fashion. This was illustrated by the recent trouble at the University of California. As one group of perceptive observers commented: "If the Berkeley experience meant any one thing, it meant that the University wasn't doing its job. It had lost its sense of purpose; it no longer had meaning to the students." [Warren Hinckle, Sol Stern, Robert Scheer, the University on the Make. Ramparts, April 1966. 11-22 (Quote p.22).]



At least three major groups comprise institutions of higher learning: Administrative officers, faculty members, and students. It bears repeating to note again that each is characterized by allegiance to the foregoing value-complexes that differ in such a way as to produce a continuing fairly high level of strain.

Turning first to the goals and actions of university officials, we might begin with Walter Lippman's description that the high administrator must "raise money...appease the alumni...get around the trustees, state legislatures, the foundations, the Pentagon...ingratiate himself with the chamber of commerce, the board of trade, the clergy, tranquilize the egos of the faculty, deal with the students in their academic lives, their ideological lives, their sexual lives (and) be cheerful and good fellows." [Walter Lippman, The University, The New Republic, May 28, 1966, 17-20. (Quote p. 17).] Needless to say, such adaptations are quite likely to involve more than a little self-estrangement, that central component of alienation.

Administration per se requires a separation from others and from self; however, those in positions of power have a higher probability of getting their own way with university officers than others who command less force -- force which is usually measurable in terms of funds, publicity, good connections, etc. In other words, large benefactors, trustees, and legislators exert greater influence than students and faculty members. Adroit officials survive the rigors of these stresses, but the contemporaneous mood seems to be less tolerant of former flexibilities.

We may understand the institutional role of the high university officer from another source. Clearly a combination of self and external selection goes into making an administrator. There is the likelihood that, even though such a person may come from the academic ranks, he has internalized strongly the success-achievement imperative of our culture. Let us not assume that there is anything wrong per se in this, for we do believe that each person should actualize his capabilities in the fullest manner possible. The problem may develop in the adjustments required in the realization of these primary cultural value-goals. The pattern of social-managerial skills he necessarily has to begin his ascent must continue to develop, and this process must further involve the proverbial skin thickening because decisions, termed objective, will have to satisfy higher echelons more than those on lower levels in the long run. Separation from former colleagues or from former styles of perception and action is thus a necessary concomitant of administration.

Gradually public relations functions and those relating to technical institutional operation supplant educational concerns, that is assuming the primary role of a university to be an educational one. More and more energy is thus channeled into extra-educational duties and requirements as this happens simply to be the nature of the institutional beast at high levels. It is thus only natural that these demands reflect back on the intra-institutional process itself. Students and faculty acquire utility for public impression. A school's reputation must be enhanced for it will rebound to its long run advantage financially, and theoretically in general excellence on all levels. But what actions will best serve such ends? Good teaching is surprisingly little appreciated, and accordingly gets comparable publicity. Students value it and faculty members may rightfully take pride in such performance, but administrative officers, as much as they may personally desire it, are hard put to use this domain in a concrete manner to enhance their institutional image.

In brief, teaching seems mundane and prosaic, and by itself lacks the monetary drawing power so necessary to the maintenance and expansion of colleges and universities. And surely the success of high administration is measured by its concrete accomplishments of more buildings, large enrollments, and favorable publicity such as might result from an outpouring of research, books, papers, and the acquisition of grants and contracts.

Administrators may further try to maintain a balance between doing a good educational job and fulfilling these success requirements; however, it is given to very few institutions to have the wherewithal to do this in an acceptable manner. The scales are thus quite likely to tip away from scholarly and teaching functions in favor of those that can be fruitfully used for both personal and institutional advancement.

In other words, the nature of high administration in terms of its position requirements, the people who fulfill these ranks, and the changes brought about during the progression from lower to higher levels necessarily demands emphases that have a high probability of clashing with the scholarly, intellectual, and educational aspects of university life.

Turning to the faculty, we can also see many patterns of conflicting motives and aspirations in this group, but their institutional position naturally sets this group theoretically within our hypothesized secondary American value system, that concerned with equality and responsibility.

Again, initially taking a puristic slant, we might accept the idea that those who seek a career as scholars and teachers in university settings probably desire other than their own economic aggrandizement, which happens to be contrary to the main direction achievement-success motivation takes in American society. Neither would it seem likely that prestige and power are to be attained through the realization of their aspirations.

In sum, central to graduate training and the academic life, is a somewhat idealistic commitment to intellectual and aesthetic goals. The nature of the university can, however, be disillusioning to traditional scholars because financial incentives and reputation go together. Not a few individuals who begin their careers with a devotion to the esoterica of their chosen field later find that greater satisfaction attends the recognition and rewards that follow political advancement within their own profession and university setting. Commitment to the search for knowledge and the desire to impart this to others thus often give way to activities that will enhance oneself within the success-achievement mold of our society.

It would be hard to deny that scholarly research and teaching do not engender the utmost responsibilities. The secondary value components hypothesized earlier are thus core elements of the teaching and learning processes. Moral behavior of the highest order is demanded and an altruistic optimism relative to one's potential influence and contributions must also be part of this dedication. Naturally realities diverge from ideals, but there is little doubt that academic halls are well infused with intellectual idealism.

Given such a general orientation, it is understandable that a basis exists for conflict between administrative officers and faculty members. In many institutions, a smoldering of resentment characterizes this relationship. Faculty feel they are being pushed and pulled in directions inimical to their professional aspirations. The "publish or perish" theme so popular today may result in an increase in research, though this has yet to be proven. It will certainly act to select a certain kind of faculty member, one who in the pursuit of his research interests may find himself slighting his teaching duties. Much complaint has been heard on this score.

Another question has also been phrased. Is the research conducted of significance and note? Undoubtedly committed scholars and scientists will resist pressures to publish for the sake of simply pub-

lishing; however, there can also be no doubt that much of that which does find a place in professional journals is of questionable worth. There are many faculty who, by virtue of their interests and abilities, are simply not researchers, but it is not difficult, if one must, to find a research area of relative compatibility that may be pursued in a mechanical and trivial way. The growing number of professional journals in virtually all fields almost guarantees the publication of any pedestrian work, and administration is unlikely to be able to distinguish one journal from another.

Similarly, book publishers are hungry for manuscripts and today if a person is judged to have potential, an outline for an intended text is usually enough to bring forth a contract on most impressive terms. The outcome of these efforts is rarely a work of the highest caliber, but it appears to be a major effort, which, if diligently followed, will cause a shift away from other educational roles.

In addition, there is no doubt that colleges and universities are developing a body of faculty who do little more than their own personal work, and who throw an excess burden of teaching on graduate assistants and young, new faculty. A few schools are also notorious for the practice of hiring those who have just graduated with their doctorates and holding them until they are up for tenure, at which time they are released.

Clearly faculty roles are confused. Granted a desire to write and publish, there is much reason to believe that pressures in this direction are having their detrimental effects. Graduate and undergraduate students are further being increasingly employed to do many of the mechanics of such work, and its quality is often highly suspect. Traditional educational duties have been shunted aside in too many instances, and usually with the implicit blessing of those in high quarters. We must seriously ask whether there is room for a good scholarly teacher in our universities since teaching does not seem to be highly valued except in a few noteworthy institutions. As desirable as it is to have that combination of active researcher, book writer, and first-rate teacher, it is a relatively rare phenomenon, whether we like to admit it or not. Faculty know this and are in turmoil within their own ranks as to what their roles should be. A deletion among their traditional responsibilities has been forced upon them, and fractionation of faculties along the lines of research vs. teaching has developed in many locales. Needless to say, discontent is a natural concomitant of this state of affairs because it may parallel a distinction of those who are in or out of administrative favor.

Whether oriented toward research, teaching, or writing, or some combination of these activities, in faculty groups community responsibilities should still take precedence over individual politico-economic enhancement. This is manifested in another facet of the university atmosphere which has been known to cause more than a few sleepless nights for administrators, namely the concept of academic freedom.

Learned individuals may have open minds, but if they are receptive to new ideas they are usually not empty ones, therefore such persons usually take a stand within their own and related endeavors. Today, especially in the social sciences, this often spills over into the popular domain and faculty members are notable in the ranks of protest against the atmosphere of conformity in matters social, political, economic, and moral that pervades our nation. Neither their knowledge or their position may be appreciated. The few who stand out in these activities are often backed by a larger fearful group who believe similarly but play the game. Others simply are not interested and another group purveys the popular theme. But the damage has been done and it may affect institutional operation through the pressures influential persons and groups bring to bear on school officials.

The AAUP Bulletin provides ample documentation of what may happen when the scholar steps out of the ivory tower and exercises his responsibilities. The clash of success and responsibility values may then become publicly evident.

Because of the foregoing differences in viewpoint, it is not unexpected that the question of who should really run institutions of higher learning and how they should be operated is often in contention between faculty bodies and administration. Both groups are split. Financial and public-image considerations are not the foremost consideration of the teacher and scholar, and commitment to the idea of making the truth public may seriously conflict with the viewpoint of officialdom. Formal power is vested in the latter though in many institutions the faculty may maintain a strong counter-role. Still there are communication difficulties and sets to respond in conflicting ways. Suspicion and distrust is thus a common component relating these two groups.

But what of this third group, the students who represent even a greater variety of backgrounds, outlooks and aspirations. Largely having been protected from the world, a goodly proportion maintain their adolescent idealism. Others become what Goldsen calls "reluctant recruits" and surrender their hopes

to make the holy dollar. Yet the transition from high school to college must, in the majority of these minds, be more than just a mechanical continuation of education. A gap is being bridged and something new and stimulating is probably anticipated by the entering freshman. These hopes may be largely shattered by the routinization of work and the meeting of course requirements. High school with more effort and impersonality thus seems to characterize this new experience. Despite this attempt at mechanization, perceptive administration and faculty are often impressed by the persistence of idealism among many if not most students. Despite the meaninglessness of much of that to which they are exposed, and growing feelings of helplessness, they respond almost too readily to the potential of changing this situation. Opportunities to humanize relationships with university officials and faculty are seized upon. Good teaching and personal consideration are likewise appreciated in an almost compulsively hungering manner.

Unfortunately, however, a distance is maintained between students and those other groups that determine their environment through the medium of traditional roles. Classes are also large and individual dignity is submerged in what at best may be a superficial give-and-take that is transitory. The instructor thus seems to move freely through a situation in which little or no confrontation occurs with students. Almost any other interest or activity can shunt aside teaching or relational functions and tests or the substitution of student and graduate assistants will suffice to fill classroom time and duties.

In brief, what started out for many students as a much hoped for exciting experience all too rapidly seems to deteriorate into an anomic, purposeless sequence of almost chance connected and determined events. Most make the adaptation required by this situation. They attend classes, put forth a minimum effort, are carried along by their basic intelligence that is rarely challenged, and finally end up wondering what to do next. Not all are so willing to sacrifice their integrity and hopes, and they struggle to make sense out of this situation. As Katz and Sanford note, such activists want something better, hence the current wave of protest and demonstration. [Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford, *Causes of the Student Revolution*, Saturday Review, Dec. 18, 1965, 64-66, 76,79).]

In the furor and unfavorable publicity that has attended these actions, we have lost sight of a component that definitely has been everpresent, namely the desire to bring coherence and purpose to their superficially ordered lives. This search for dignity

and meaning involves a reluctance to give up those ideals that faculty have often surrendered and administration use so freely in the opening sentences of college catalogs. Students know that they are usually being short-changed, and as Katz and Sanford also note, they are now "asking for a voice and a vote in the determination of their own education." [*Ibid*, p. 64.] This should not be taken lightly. They deserve more than just a hearing.

Like the faculty, these motives are actuated by a relatively small core of the student body behind which are many more quiescent and sympathetic individuals. The morality and responsibility of this stance cannot, however, be doubted. Furthermore, this search for individuality is not competitive, practical, and separationist, but rather social, hence such centrally concerned students plus the majority of their less active associates may be conceptualized within the purview of the secondary American value pattern suggested here.

This is, of course, a contentious generalization for college has also become a haven for many uncommitted and alienated youth. Kenneth Keniston has recently singled out this group for study. [*Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1965.] The work of Goldsen and her colleagues [Rose K. Goldsen, Morris Rosenberg, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Edward A. Suchman, *What College Students Think*. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1960.] and Philip Jacob [Philip E. Jacob, *Changing Values in College*. New York: Harper, 1957.] will also hardly excite anyone on the socio-cultural potentiality of college students.

Nevertheless, much of their apparent unthinking conformity and shallowness might be interpreted as more due to ignorance and inexperience than willful rejection of social responsibility. In fact, their attitudes toward minorities and equality suggest an almost idealistic acceptance of humanitarian themes. Students like faculty and administration are complex and multiform in their outlook and approach to the world. Still, it is hypothesized that equalitarian-responsibility value premises are focal to this group.

In sum, values are tied to the positions occupied by these three groups and the roles practiced by their members. They naturally include barriers to effective cooperation and organization by tending to deny honest communication. This is mainly a function of the power and prestige relationships set up among segments of the university. In our society such patterns parallel identification with the primary and



secondary value patterns defined here. In the educational setting this is questionably related to the basic historical functions of the university. We must then seriously ask why an institution devoted to learning and scholarship values administration more highly than those central functions. This seems totally illogical since a secondary institutional role takes precedence over its primary purpose. Yet this is fundamental to the organizational problem of the university, and results from the fact that it has been modeled structurally after a traditional business establishment. Such patterning takes as its basis the achievement-success framework and this may be a tragic error since it contributes to the nature of the deregulation discussed here.

It would seem obvious that the aura of coordinated organization that covers higher education really makes fundamental differences in group purposes and motivation. The problems of value-selection within this setting can also be viewed as worsening, largely because the purpose of the university is becoming more obscure. Is it to be an avenue toward truth, a means of enhancing the ability to think, a way of "getting ahead" or "fitting in"? Or does it primarily perform the social-economic function of keeping a sizable number of persons off of the labor market for four years?

Lack of a coherent and meaningful direction for the institution as a whole is seen here as also an outgrowth of conflict between the foregoing value patterns as they are manifested by their champions in our society. Clearly this struggle must have its repercussions on all levels of the university. Thus we find that administration, faculty, and students, who should be effectively integrated with each other as participants in a common activity find themselves acting as disparate, poorly related entities. As confused as their value-premises are, their setting demands the realization of human freedom within the bounds of community responsibility, not the fracturing of these into separate goals. Such is essential to the development of any real organization.

Much soul searching and self-scrutiny is thus required. Administrators, in revising their current values, might be able to reactivate many latent and suppressed hopes. Likewise academic careerists among the faculty must re-examine their notions and behavior to meet the goals that justify their existence. Students would thus have an arena for gaining the maturity their ideals demand. Activity toward such ends would necessarily place the university back into its proper historical-cultural position and go far toward resolving the organizational problems that now exist.



However, as long as higher education fails to take a clear stand relative to those values it should represent and transmit, the difficulties that are growing within this system can never be solved by it.

I know this is all very idealistic and puristic and so forth, and that the universities may have many, many associations like this that get together, and I wish I knew how many, because I have seen a list and it is very, very long. The organizations do not relate to each other. They very rarely question their basic premises.

If I look at this organization, the first question I would ask is, if I take student personnel people, are there really many institutional similarities among them -- not their perception so much, but it seems to me it would be a terribly vaguely defined area oftentimes attached to the specific person fulfilling the position, that he must make it, and that it is oftentimes a chance phenomenon, depending upon who is in the position above the person, or the amount of people he has and how they relate to him.

Basically, what I am saying is that we may not like to look at it, but universities are surprisingly disorganized institutions that have just an aura about them of coherence and direction, and it is not my feeling that you could really get so many threads of coherence about them because from the very top down in their basic purposes there is a considerable anomy to be found.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN CHICK: Thank you, Dr. Spilka, for that very insightful presentation. Dr. Spilka has indicated he will be very happy to respond to any questions that any of you might have. If there is anyone who would care to raise a question, we would appreciate your indicating your school and name.

... Discussion period followed ...

SEMINAR  
Tuesday - June 28, 1966

"The Role of Intercollegiate  
Athletics in Higher Education --  
A Reconsideration"

The Seminar on "The Role of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education -- A Reconsideration," held in the Grand Ballroom, Tuesday afternoon, June 28, 1966, convened at two-ten o'clock, Dean Lyle Reynolds, Dean of Students, University of California, Santa Barbara, California, presiding.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: What we hope to do is to have some discussion between you and the panelists, so can we ask you gentlemen to please come forward to the front of the room.

Welcome to the afternoon panel on intercollegiate athletics and higher education, the relationship between the two.

The beginning of this panel stems all the way back to our last Conference in Washington, D. C., when President Nygreen asked me if I would initiate and take steps to get a panel like this one together to explore relationships that might exist between certain of our national intercollegiate athletic organizations and NASPA; to see, for example, if a dialog between NASPA and the national organizations, NCCA, NAIA, and so on, might be to the benefit of both organizations, and perhaps most important of all, of benefit to our students.

An ad hoc committee was formed later of myself, Dean Francis Smiley from the Colorado School of Mines, and Dean Arleigh Williams from the University of California at Berkeley. We have hopes that this ad hoc committee can continue and work on problems such as the identification of problems in this area, in which they may stimulate research leading, hopefully, to a broader understanding and maybe a solution of the problems to some degree.

One of our concerns, we feel, is to assist, if it proves to be desirable, in integrating intercollegiate athletic programs with the student personnel services so that focus might be placed upon students in some instances where it might not exist.

In the early phases of developing the panel we asked the topflight men in the country, we felt, to participate in the panel, and right off the bat one of our first panelists was shot. I began to worry at that

particular point whether serving on this panel had some meaning along this direction. But up to this point, no panelist has been injured in any way. This panelist, you may be interested in knowing, was Mr. James Corbett from Louisiana State University, who this past year served as National Chairman of the Association of Directors of Athletics. He is recovering, but unable to be with us today.

Then as we began to develop the panel a little further. My own nervousness about the development of the panel began to perhaps approach that of one of my friends who lives out in the Mohave Desert, who had great concern about going to Los Angeles and driving on the Freeways in Los Angeles. Finally he decided that he was going to visit Los Angeles, and in fact to try to drive on those Freeways. All his buddies advised him to stay off the Freeways, that this was a pretty dangerous operation.

So he went to Los Angeles, stayed off the Freeways, driving into town using all the circuitous routes, and was in Los Angeles several days, but watched the people whizzing back and forth on the Freeways above him. And his desire to get up on there and drive on it became so great that he couldn't resist any longer. So he came to a fortuitous solution. He decided he would get up on Sunday morning and drive on the Freeways. He reasoned that at that particular point all the Catholics would be in church, and all the Protestants would be in bed, and all the Jews would be in Palm Springs. (Laughter) So he got up and drove back and forth on the Freeway, and was hit and severely injured by a Seventh Day Adventist. (Laughter)

What I would like to do initially is introduce our panelists and let you listen to them.

First, two members of the committee are on the panel; they will not make presentations but will participate in the discussion. The first of these is Dean Arleigh Williams, Dean of Students at Berkeley. He was an undergraduate at Berkeley. We were in the same class at Berkeley, and he was an outstanding football player and halfback. As I remember Arleigh, he was the kind of person when the big ends and tackles swept in upon him, he stood with great coolness and kicked the ball out and kept us out of danger, consistently and regularly. I am sure that this kind of courage and fortitude has been the kind of thing that has brought him through the episodes at Berkeley with flying colors. As a matter of fact, all of us in the University of California are proud that Arleigh really is the only staff member in these areas at Berkeley who not only survived the episodes in the fall of 1964, but

came out of it with a promotion. When the episodes began in the fall of 1964, Arleigh was the Dean of Men; today he is Dean of Students.

After graduating from Berkeley, Arleigh worked at the College of Marin as Director of Athletics, football coach and Dean of Men for some time. Then he moved to Berkeley as the Dean of Men, and following these episodes recently became the Dean of Students.

Sitting on my immediate right, another member of the committee, is Dean Francis C. Smiley of Colorado School of Mines. Fran is a graduate of the Colorado School of Mines, with a degree in Civil Engineering and Petroleum Engineer. He served in the armed forces and went back to Colorado as the PMS&T. Then he gradually began moving into teaching engineering and eventually became Dean of Students.

His special interest is photogrammetry. At the present time Fran is the Secretary of the NCAA, and is on their special committee on recruiting and financial aids, and on other committees that play a rather important role in the administration of the NCAA.

Then I would like to introduce -- sitting to Dean William's left -- Mr. Balch, who comes to us, most immediately as the Director of the Capital Program of Deerfield Academy in Deerfield, Massachusetts. He has been the Vice Chancellor of Affairs at Irvine, Dean of Men at Stanford University, and has been involved for much of his career in fund raising activities for Stanford University, for the Mental Research Institute, for which he was the Director in Palo Alta. We are pleased to have him on the panel.

To Dick's left, I would like to introduce Admiral Thomas J. Hamilton. Admiral Hamilton graduated from the Naval Academy and then after his undergraduate career there--I should also point out that he was an All-American on the team in 1926 while he was an undergraduate at the Academy.

Following his undergraduate experiences at the Academy, he earned his Wings at Pensacola, and during World War II many of us knew him as the Director of the Navy's pre-flight schools. I was in one of those myself for a short while. Then eventually he ended up as the executive officer and commanding officer of the USS Enterprise.

He returned to the Academy after World War II as the football coach and director of athletics, served

as the director of athletics at the University of Pittsburgh for ten years. At the present time he is Executive Director of the Athletic Association of Western Universities here on the Coast.

Next I would like to present Mr. Richard Larkins, Director of Athletics at Ohio State University. Dick was an outstanding athlete at Ohio State as an undergraduate. He became the Director of Athletics in 1946 and has been serving in that capacity since. He is on the Executive Committee of the NCAA, and is the President-Elect of the National Association of Directors of Athletics.

On my far right let me introduce to you Mr. Jeremiah Ford, who is the Director of Athletics at Pennsylvania. Mr. Ford is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, earning his M.A. and B.A. degrees there. After finishing at Pennsylvania he went to Hobart College where he coached football and served as an instructor of English for some time. He returned in 1937 to Pennsylvania to serve as an instructor in the English Department, and worked in the intercollegiate athletic program. At the close of the war, he went to St. George's School as head of the English Department and football coach, and he assumed his duties at the University of Pennsylvania in 1953. He has been significant as a leader in the Ivy League, as a chairman of the Ivy League Administrative Committee, and a number of other executive committees in the Ivy League which establish policy. Welcome to the panel.

Last but far from least, I would like to introduce Dr. Paul Giddens, President of Hamline University. Dr. Giddens received his A.B. from Simpson College, his M.A. from Harvard, and his Ph.D. from the State University of Iowa. He has a distinguished career of teaching in various parts of the country, having been on the faculty at the University of Kansas, Iowa State, State University of Iowa, Oregon State, Allegheny College and then served as the President of Hamline since 1953. He was a Guggenheim Fellow in 1945 and has a long list of publications. He also is a director of many important and significant organizations in the country.

Each of these panelists is going to present his own points of view, and then we hope we can elicit some discussion from the group so we hope that while they are making their presentations, you may be formulating questions that you would like to place to the panelists.

To begin our discussion this afternoon, I would like to introduce Mr. Richard Balch. Dick.

DR. RICHARD BALCH (Executive Administrator, Mental Research Institute, Palo Alta, California):  
Mr. Chairman, Panelists, Guests: Let me preface what I have to say by suggesting that at no time in history has there been a feeling of satisfaction with the status quo in education. As an example, let me quote:

"There are doubts concerning the business of education since all people do not agree in those things they would have a child taught, both with respect to improvement in virtue and a happy life; nor is it clear whether the object of it should be to improve the reason or rectify the morals. From the present mode of education we cannot determine, with certainty that to which men incline, whether to instruct a child in what will be useful to him in life, or what tends to virtue, or what is excellent; for all of these things have their separate defenders."

--Aristotle in 400 B.C.

So, too, has each generation criticized its youth. Again, may I quote:

"The children now love luxury; they have no manners, have contempt for authority; they show disrespect for elders and love to chatter instead of exercise; they contradict their elders, misbehave before company, gobble up dainties at the table; cross their legs and tyrannize over their teachers."

--Socrates in 500 B.C.

You can draw your own conclusions, fatalistic or optimistic, from early civilization. My personal choice is one of optimism, because generations of men have dealt with the same problems for a long time.

It seems to me perhaps we are addressing ourselves to the same problems today. As a former dean of men, as a former director of athletics, and whatever else you want to name, I think there is a great opportunity for many of you present in an unclaimed job that is open to you and the stakes are rather high.

Who, for instance, will take the responsibility, if you do not, for finally controlling a technology that now nearly controls its makers?

Who will finally decide that human beings should again speak to each other and live with each other instead of retreating farther behind gadgets and devices?

Where will the cycle be broken that generally means that a child must begin life with most of the

same prejudices and blindnesses that his parents had? Will this generation produce a significant number of leaders that admit their own failures instead of passing them on as traditions?

Can we recapture control of our own age which we call modern just because it is new?

These things are threatening and they are the kinds of things that you and I can do something about. At stake is human society and human values and I think an examination of what is going on in this world should cause a bit of alarm.

We are starting to conquer space, and I was sitting in a living room not too long ago when the lives of two men were in danger trying to come back to earth. Thousands of television viewers objected to having the re-run of "I Love Lucy" interrupted by the report of the dramatic event. Many of you remember.

As one further effort to set the stage, may I quote John Stuart Mill from his essay on "Liberty."

"A state which always dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands....will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

I suggest to you that we may continue in universities to make rules and to pay lip service to ethical conduct and principles, but until our actions convey the convictions of "great men" we are wasting our time.

To state the problem as a parent, a would-be-educator and, specifically as a former vice-chancellor for student affairs, I find the panel topic difficult to discuss in two parts: education and athletics. Education, to me, is the aggregate experience of the individual through which he may act purposefully, think rationally and deal effectively with his environment. If you accept such a definition, athletics are a part of education. Thus, our discussion involves the variety of means by which we accomplish this particular goal.

The transformation that has taken place in American school and college sports during the last fifty years has progressively imposed confusion and serious conflict in the minds of those concerned with the function to be served by institutions of learning.

As the social order has undergone change, so have human agencies been influenced. The question we

face today is one of how best to organize the multiplicity of functions seeking room under the "education tent." We cannot serve every cause in any one institution. Our need is to recognize the variety of purposes served in our several types of institutions and to encourage a self-declared forthright pursuit of those purposes.

Declaration of educational purpose is assumed to be within the rights and obligations of the governing bodies of each institution. Specifically, defense of intellectual integrity is the responsibility of our individual faculties, presidents and headmasters. To acknowledge such rights and responsibilities is to admit that no national organization should be called upon to enforce legislation that relieves institutions of their responsibility.

Let me be blunt and specific. The entertainment dollar has been spread so thin and competition for athletic talent so great that the National Collegiate Athletic Association has been called upon to regulate "fair trade" practices for the young athletes of America.

Individual conferences unable to cope with recruiting problems have turned to a national body for detailed policing of their affairs. We now face at the national level a problem of mutual distrust so great that a purely amateur athletic program cannot exist within the regulations.

Throughout the nation gate receipts and sports page prestige have dictated the need for restrictive measures in the collegiate search for physical prowess. The result can mean the elimination of your son from recreation he may seek in competitive athletics.

If your son happens to be a young man sought after by institutions of higher education, he is a student athlete. If, on the other hand, he is late in reaching his physical maturity, but qualifies for college, he could well be an athletic student.

Rather than beg the legalistic ramifications of what may exist for your son, let me be specific. Because of the demand for trained manpower, M.I.T. admits a Freshman Class of 900. In such a group one finds a broad cross-section of American manhood. Through the demands of 3,600 undergraduates, an inter-collegiate program of 17 sports has evolved.

Many of you are admitting young men qualified, by definition, as student athletes and athletic students. If we live by the regulations promulgated



by the N.C.A.A., we must discover means by which we can:

1) Make certain no student participating on an intercollegiate team obtains a Christmas job prior to seven days before the Institute's Vacation period. This can be allowed only if we can make certain that said student could not otherwise obtain the job.

2) We must determine how a student participating on an intercollegiate team chose to visit the campus. If two or more alumni chose to share expenses in driving one or more boys to the campus, such students are ineligible for competition in an intercollegiate contest.

3) We must make certain no prospective student swims in the pool if he later hopes to qualify as an intercollegiate swimmer.

4) If we find through investigation that an alumnus has afforded company funds in paying the automobile expenses to visit the campus and a student who later attends M.I.T. was riding in the car, he, too, is ineligible for intercollegiate competition.

5) We must make certain that no student participating on an intercollegiate team has travelled with an alumnus to witness an intercollegiate athletic contest off-campus.

6) Now we are considering again -- this was going on some years ago -- the signing of a contract referred to as a "pre-registration certificate," with all of the fair trade practices defined among the several income-producing sports. Literally a professional contract.

In order to avoid all of the above probable infractions, it would be necessary that we ask all alumni and friends to contribute the monies they might use, in bringing a student to the campus, to a central fund. We could then pay the travel expenses for all students who show any interest in furthering their academic career at our respective institutions. To do otherwise, as we will, will mean gambling with the problem of who is the student athlete and who is the athletic student.

As parents we must be aware of the program imposed by our own national association. Conformity is requested in place of integrity. Rather than establishing individual internal policies, an attitude of misery loves company has been fostered by the detailed breakdown of National Collegiate Athletic rules.

Assuming there is value derived from an inter-collegiate program for the education of our youth, more time can be spent showing the relationship and less time spent devising rules. All of our institutions have an important stake in this problem. We have helped to contribute to the technological development providing more leisure time, more spectator mediums and a nonchalance toward participation.

The Ivy League has not resolved all of the problems of pride in Alma Mater as displayed on the athletic field, but it has drawn together eight institutions whose presidents have stated their common goal. This degree of conformity provides a base for some reality so long as visits to campuses, what constitutes a visit, what route you took, are not imposed upon this small league of eight institutions.

One of the great strengths of higher education in the United States is the variety and difference in our educational institutions. National legislation imposed upon your son is not only unrealistic, but cannot be policed. By such legislation we place a premium on what one can "get away with" rather than what is right for any one institution.

The code for the National Collegiate Athletic Association must be limited to principles and practices which preserve institutional conferences and regional rights for freedom of thought and action. Progress has not been made by throwing the ball at the N.C.A.A. and hoping the solution will happen.

Presidents, faculty, and alumni can declare their intent as an institution dedicated to the conservation, promulgation, and expansion of knowledge. If, within this declaration, there is incorporated the need to field an intercollegiate team that will excel in the world of entertainment, this can be made perfectly clear and the hypocrisy of the present day deterred -- if not eliminated.

I would like to add one more thought to what I have said. President Conant, former President of Harvard, for several years now has not only been studying the high school, but the junior high school. He came out with what, in my judgment, was a tragic statement at the end of his investigation of junior high schools, in which he was condemning the emphasis placed on the athletic program. To me, he did more to drive the lesser intellect to the rationalization for his reason for being than any other one man in the country.

I suggest to you, gentlemen, that there is a project you can undertake as an Association which could

at least supplement, if not add to the literature, a program in which you spend time and money developing a stimulus in all classrooms which will capture the elements of initiative, concentration, reflection, and pride inherent in an athletic activity.

If this can be the end result of this meeting it is possible that the art of teaching will be given the encouragement it so direly needs and will return to the prominence that it once had in our society.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Dick.

Our next panelist will be Admiral Thomas Hamilton, Executive Director of the Athletic Association of Western Universities. Admiral Hamilton.

ADMIRAL THOMAS HAMILTON (Executive Director, Athletic Association of Western Universities, San Francisco, California): Mr. Chairman, distinguished panelists, Gentlemen: I rather hate to burden you with my remarks. At one time I was introduced by a young officer who had served in my outfit, and he was talking to his group. I had, as one sometimes does in an outfit like that, to battle for their interests. But he got up and he said, "Now this man has gone through hell for you, and the least you can do is go through hell with him." (Laughter)

So my apologies, but I will start off in this high priced batting order we have. I think with the power we have in the panel I am supposed to bunt, but I am generally a free swinger, so I am going to play for the hit and run.

Before this erudite group of top-flight educational administrators, it seems to me there is little need to answer the critics of intercollegiate athletics, but I will start there.

I think you are well aware of the tendency of one type of educator, so grooved in his dedication to a specialty or subject that he would diminish other activities in order that his own may be accorded more emphasis and attention. Invariably the first rock that they pick up and throw is directed at football or intercollegiate sports, and invariably the statement draws a headline for the detractor.

One of this group which I would like to strongly disavow and rebutt is Admiral Rickover, who has made a lot of gratuitous observations about education and has gone out of his way to damn sports and

all physical activities of youth. Let's give Admiral Rickover due credit for his technical and administrative skill in the development of nuclear submarines; but his naval record has been specialized, and he does not enjoy the breadth to oppose the considered opinions of officers such as Admirals Halsey and Nimitz, or General Eisenhower, who have all stated that sports training has been most essential in the development and make-up of leaders.

I consider myself extremely fortunate to have had two careers in fields that I have enjoyed tremendously -- first in the Navy, and secondly in sports. The activities are not dissimilar. I will beg your indulgence to outline my Navy experience a little, simply because it was there that I learned the value of sports.

At the Naval Academy -- and it is the same at West Point and the Air Force Academy -- every student is expected to take part in sports, in addition to participating in an excellent physical education course where basic skills are imparted. I had a rich experience of playing beside a great many schoolmates in intercollegiate football, basketball, and baseball. We derived the same benefits as participants at any other college, but I believe the importance of these relationships were dramatized more in military life and made an indelible impression upon me. The dog-eat-dog practice and competition to make the team within one's own squad gives one a true perspective of the strength, stamina, agility (both mental and physical), determination, cooperativeness, sportsmanship, and even courage of each of one's teammates. The acceptance of common challenges with the carrying out of individual responsibilities lets one know and appreciate the great qualities of others and one's own limitations. It is most rare that a phoney can ever result from this type of training, and if he does develop, I would attribute it as likely to be the effect of later influences.

I found in the Navy that this same kind of knowledge and confidence in my fellow pilots was essential in the close teamwork of aircraft squadrons in the various disciplines of shooting and bombing and operating on the carriers, and even instrument flying in bad weather. Furthermore, the respect built for my opponents in athletics was worthwhile and important, not only in the give-and-take of normal life, but I think added a lot to the cooperation between the Army, Navy, and Marines in the field where I found my old sports opponents were close partners in military operations.

If I needed any more evidence on the values of sport, it was supplied in World War II. Admiral Radford had the conviction that many of the qualities

wanted in a Navy combat pilot could be partly developed by use of competitive sports as training measures. Some 80,000 cadets went through an extensive course in gymnastics, soccer, swimming, wrestling, boxing, football, basketball, and track in addition to their academic work and flight training. These young men thus trained, who then flew from our carriers and patrol squadrons, were superb. The same values and conditions hold true in all of our colleges.

It is well and good to strengthen and improve the academic training of youth, but let it not be done at the expense of physical fitness and all-round disciplinary training that has contributed so much to the make-up of worthwhile Americans.

May I quote President Ralph Cooper Hutchinson of Lafayette College, who in an article gave football the Marc Anthony treatment at the outset leading the reader to believe he has stepped forward to bury college football, not to praise it, and then states, "I shall now say why I believe football is of enormous value and importance to the college; why it should have more attention and leadership, not less, and why in some cases it should cost more money, not less. Through no design or deliberation on the part of any man or group of men, football has become the emotionally integrating force of the American college. The place of emotions in the culture of a people and in the development of a nation or its institutions has never been adequately measured. Therefore football is not generally understood. It is an emotional phenomenon. It is the symbol about which are gathered the loyalties of students, faculty, alumni, and friends of the college. These loyalties are, to some degree, to the very spiritual and Christian character of the college. Football is merely the integrating symbol about which such loyalties are rallied and through which they are integrated. Football has a mission which is intangible and obscure but tremendously important."

President Leo Jenkins of East Carolina State says, "It is unworthy of a college to have an athletic program and then slight it, belittle it, or treat it as a necessary evil. If a college considers such a program evil, then it has a moral obligation to make an attempt to abolish it. If it is thought to be worthy, as a part of the over-all college or university program, then it should be treated with respect and dignity, and be completely supported. It is completely within the great American tradition to have a burning desire to win. This desire should be associated with the regular curriculum, also. It would approach the ludicrous for us to advise our students majoring in business not to strive for success."

Intercollegiate competition is a natural outgrowth of the American spirit of "free enterprise." In all of education and life, the greatest challenges bring forth the greatest achievements. Intramural sports are fine for recreation and relaxation, but the demands for personal excellence, sacrifice, and discipline are not inherent, and the personal benefit to the individual does not compare with the contributions of intercollegiate competition.

The criticisms and charges of the excesses and evils of intercollegiate sport are directed in many instances toward practices that have long since come under strict controls and have been largely eliminated. It is my observation that by and large most collegiate programs now are well regulated by faculty control and there is little violation of the rules. The good of intercollegiate athletics should not be questioned because of a few violations. Certainly the banking system is not under suspicion because one man is guilty of embezzlement.

The question I would like to ask, "Intercollegiate athletics being so beneficial, why don't we have more of it?" Seriously, each institution should examine itself. With the great expansion of student enrollment, has your institution added appreciably to the number of intercollegiate teams where students anxious for the chance can have the opportunities to derive the values of intercollegiate competition? Deprived of sports opportunities, students energies are directed in other channels, many of which are not as beneficial to the individual. What has happened to the junior varsity competition that used to be much more plentiful? What has happened to the large frosh squads and turnouts? I wish we might see a lightweight football competition throughout all the colleges like the 150 lb. football league in the East. This is terrific. The little guys play with the same skill as the varsity, and the games are very fast since all players are the same size.

Then I would like you to focus your attention on a new bright star appearing in our firmament -- girls sports. This area should receive your backing to provide opportunities for girls with higher sport skills to find opportunity for development and competition in college and high schools. There has been a decisive change of attitude among women physical educators to encourage a growth of girls programs, but, by and large, campus administrative support has been difficult to obtain for suitable progress.

Despite some purveyors of doom, we are enjoying the greatest era of intercollegiate athletics the

world has seen. In almost every sport, new records of achievement are being made, only to be broken the next day by different athletes. There seems to be no barrier which our wonderful young men and women cannot conquer, and they do it because of harder work and expert coaching. I wish the whole image of America could be portrayed by these handsome, strong, young products of our college and high school athletic squads. They are not only better physically, but they are smarter and more articulate than their predecessors.

Our conference is founded on a philosophy of trust and confidence which has done much to dispell the suspicion and gossip that has been so destructive in collegiate relationships. Each member-institution sends to my office admission records on their freshmen, and transcripts annually on the academic records of their student-athletes in the pressure sports of football and basketball. These are available as well as financial aid records to any official representative to check in case any questions are asked. I think it is quite significant to point out the present-day athlete is no "dummy" to give you this data:

At the eight institutions there were 524 boys on the football and basketball squads admitted.

303 or 58% had marks of 3.0 or better.

148 or 28% had marks of 3.4 or better.

58 or 11% had marks of 3.8 or better.

12 or 2.3% had perfect marks of 4.0.

In conclusion, let us broaden our athletic horizons, and give many more youths the opportunities of intercollegiate competition to bring an enlarged group the lessons in responsibility and discipline needed today in our national life.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Admiral Hamilton.

In selecting the panel we tried to present a broad spectrum and points of view on intercollegiate athletics, and you can begin to see this development, I am sure.

The next panelist will be Mr. Richard Larkins, the Director of Athletics at Ohio State University, and the new President of the National Association of Directors of Athletics. Mr. Larkins.

MR. RICHARD LARKINS (Athletic Director, Ohio State University): Thank you. Mr. Chairman, distinguished panelists, and members of your distinguished Association:

The year was 1907. At a National Convention in that year, a highly regarded sports authority remarked, "If the evils of athletics are not cleaned up, sports on the college campus will disappear within five years."

At this moment, some 59 years later, we note what a poor prophet the gentleman was. Competitive athletics are entrenched in our schools and colleges as never before. National Associations of Various kinds, including yours, have addressed themselves to the problem of justifying intercollegiate athletics. History can recount endless meetings of countless groups to define this activity. There have been President's committees, faculty committees, dean's committees, ad infinitum, trying to explain, pass legislation and attempting to control. No one will deny that improvements have been made since 1907. The NCAA, the NAIA, the conferences, the institutions have all worked diligently to create the proper atmosphere for the activity. Certainly a better climate exists today than several years ago. Yet no one can honestly say that all the evils, all the problems, all the dishonesty, all the unethical practices have disappeared. Nor can anyone say that some of our faculties do not still look at us with skepticism. The "image" is still very shaky. We are still haunted by aggressive and illegal recruiting; we are still shocked by unethical methods and procedures; we are still unable to honestly define, in this era, the "amateur."

Today we need to face the question of athletics in education as honestly and as sincerely as we can. Sidney Smith once said, "The moment Ireland is mentioned the English seem to bid adieu to common sense." I believe the same thing happens when athletics are mentioned by the academicians. Those of us working for the good of the competitive sport program are forever having to "justify" it. Perhaps this is the way it should be.

Let us take a hard look now at why we are where we are -- like it or not. The root source of many of our problems is, that while we are tolerated on the campus, we have never really been accepted. Many of our institutions refuse to fund the program and insist that it support itself through gate receipts. To fill the stadium and to get a spot of exposure by television the team must be first rate. To have a top flight team takes good, hard recruiting



in face of hard competition. This leads to violations, bending and torturing the rules, of unethical conduct. As long as people are involved, and certainly athletics does not stand alone, there will be double dealing, cheating and lack of ethics on the part of some. It has long since been proven that you cannot legislate either honesty or integrity.

Let us face then, the facts. Athletics are here to stay. They are a part of the American College scene. We know that the activity sometimes breeds difficulties and problems. "We can never assume that the number of people in the stadium is a measure of anything but the 'gate'." [J. F. Williams] We know our problem becomes compounded when we realize that the prominence of the athlete and the sometimes neglect of the physical needs of the average student, contributes nothing but woe to achieving proper purposes.

Admitting all this, the question before the house is: Are athletics worth struggling for? Are they worth saving? Can they truly be justified? My answer is an unqualified "Yes".

I have heard many definitions of "education." Let me suggest another for your consideration.

"Knowledge does not comprise all which is contained in the large term of education. The feelings are to be disciplined; the passions are to be restrained; true and worthy motives are to be inspired; a profound religious feeling is to be instilled and pure morality inculcated under all circumstances. All this is comprised in education."

Certainly the sports program, properly controlled and administered, can meet the requirements of this definition. The lessons of athletics are not like a course in civics; it is not learning about citizenship -- it is experiencing citizenship. It is having something take place inside of you. You see we are not talking about the academic classroom as the only means of securing an education. I have never been able to define "academic education." You ask me the question, "Does intercollegiate athletic competition prove conducive to the pursuance of an academic education?" I would throw questions back at each dean in this audience. Do fraternities? Do social hops and formal dances? Do May Week activities? Does Homecoming? Does campaigning for student offices, May Queen? Do intramurals? Again, ad infinitum.

Some claim over-excitement, even amounting in the minds of some, to hysteria during the football season. No one will deny that the average undergraduate is filled with excitement on a crisp Saturday

morning, when with his fellows he discusses the outcome of the afternoon game. No one will deny that after a victory he will sing a little, shout a little and perspire a little. What of it? If I had a son who reacted in any other manner -- a son, for example, who shut himself in his room, reading Freud and sneered as his classmates went singing by, I think I would be seriously worried.

Let me give you a viewpoint on publicity. A grievance of those antagonists of sport, particularly football, has always been the amount of space given by newspapers, time on radio and television, to intercollegiate athletics. If the public, beyond the university, is so greatly interested in the game that newspapers print so much about it, is it not a sign of a healthy attitude on the part of the public? If the public at large likes to have a generous amount of space in the press as an antidote to the stories of crime, scandal, divorce, lawlessness and banditry, should the game be condemned? And if your boy and mine prefer to read the wholesome (though not particularly uplifting) sports page to the unwholesome (and certainly not uplifting) pages of crime and criminality, should we not feel glad instead of heartbroken?

Then it is said that boys are spoiled by so much publicity. As a rule there is more sense in most of these boys than there is in some of their elders. Usually they will stand a great deal of spoiling, but if someone does show tendencies toward conceit, it does not take long for his teammates to take it out of him. In this connection a former President of a great University said, "The publicity of athletic success is an acid test of youth -- the weak dissolve, the strong remain. It is one of the few means of natural selection of the truly humble and unselfish, among youth that a soft civilization has left to use."

One of our problems in sports is the outcome of any game. Unless there is a tie, someone must lose, someone must win. If the theory exists that we must win at any cost, that we must be less than honest in our efforts to win, I would state emphatically that we have no place in higher education. On the other hand, it is the American tradition to "want to win." Each contestant needs self-appraisal. It is important educationally to develop self respect as well as self-appraisal. Winning is important, but not at the sacrifice of human relations and personal virtues. It is not more important than personal honesty. It is not worth the sacrifice of self respect. It must be achieved within an acceptable framework which bounds the culture of the group -- which is best described in the Holy Bible, the Constitution of the United States and the rule book of the sport.

Let me close by making a comparison between intercollegiate athletics and the automobile. In recent months the automobile industry has been under scrutiny by Congress. Despite efforts to engineer a better car, produce better roads, educate the driver, the slaughter on the highway goes on. No one has even remotely suggested eliminating the automobile. I believe athletic competition has educational value to the participant. We, like the automobile, will not be eliminated from the American scene. Perhaps we need better rules and smoother highways, and there can be no question that we will always be at the mercy of the careless driver in our profession.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Mr. Larkins.

Our next panelist wrote an article which appeared in the December issue of the Atlantic Monthly. Some of you may have seen it. In case you did not, you will want to hear his point of view with regard to intercollegiate athletics. I give you the President of Hamline University at St. Paul, Minnesota, Dr. Paul Giddens.

DR. PAUL H. GIDDENS (President, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota): Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, and Gentlemen of the audience: In discussing the subject of intercollegiate athletics and higher education, I would like to raise two fundamental questions.

First, for whose benefit should colleges and universities conduct an intercollegiate athletic program? I have always maintained that intercollegiate athletics exist primarily for the enjoyment and benefit of students who wish to participate in their favorite sports. The same is true of all other co-curricular college activities -- choir, band, student publications, debate, dramatics, etc. All of these activities supplement formal classroom learning; they provide outlets for learning by doing; and they contribute to the development of students' special talents and skills. Intercollegiate athletics also exist for the benefit of the students who enjoy seeing their fellow students engage in competitive contests. There is little or no justification, educationally speaking, for maintaining intercollegiate athletics for any other reasons.

Second, are intercollegiate athletics an integral part of the educational program or are they something separate and independent and have little or no relationship to the educational program, except for the

fact that they are played under the name of a college or university? If they are an integral part of the educational program, then the practices and policies followed by colleges and universities should be in accord with their proclaimed educational objectives. If they are not, then these institutions should be honest enough to admit it, get out of the whole business of intercollegiate athletics, and not sail under false colors.

My point of view is that intercollegiate athletics are not being conducted primarily for the benefit of the student-players and the students but for entertaining the general public, making money through gate receipts and radio and television broadcasts to finance intercollegiate athletics, intramural sports, the physical education program, athletic scholarships, mortgages on bigger and better field houses and stadiums, and winning public acclaim. They have become a big business.

One example of this is the fact that the National Broadcasting Company has just completed a two-year \$13,044,000 contract with the NCAA for the broadcast of football games. Last October the NCAA and the American Broadcasting Company announced the signing of a contract to broadcast football games for 1966 and 1967 at a price of \$15.6 million with an option to extend the contract through 1968 and 1969 for an additional price of nearly \$17 million. A \$32.6 million dollar contract! Intercollegiate athletics have become increasingly commercialized and professionalized and subject to pressures wholly alien to an amateur athletic program. As a result, colleges and universities are following, condoning, and permitting shoddy and questionable practices and policies which are hardly in accord with their high purposes.

What are some of these questionable policies and practices:

1. It is no longer a case of fielding the best possible team of bona fide students from a school's natural drawing area. Full-time members of the coaching staff are employed the year round to scour the country, and Canada, scout high school games, interview star players and offer them all sorts of inducements to enroll at their college or university. They bid for these players as if they were on the auction block. They employ them by giving financial aid -- irrespective of need. Last year one Big Ten university spent \$223,771, a second \$245,000 and four over \$300,000 each for athletic scholarships.

2. To qualify for financial aid, the scholastic standard for athletes is shamefully low. For example: under Big Ten rules a Freshman must predict a grade point average of 1.7 (a D) and show a minimum of progress during the next three years to retain his financial aid but he can get financial aid for four years without ever attaining a C average. What is even worse is the use of a double standard. Students, who are non-athletes, are required by many of these same universities to have a higher grade point average than athletes in order to qualify for financial aid.
3. The pressures are so great to get athletes that some colleges and universities are known to use a double standard for admission, one for athletes and one for all other students; they will accept college entrance examination scores from 10 to 20 points below those for other students.
4. Once student athletes are admitted to college they are in many cases given preferential treatment of all kinds, some within the rules and some without:

They are segregated from other students and lodged and fed in special dormitories.

They are allowed to take reduced class schedules during the game season.

Special tutors are employed in case they are not doing well in their studies.

They are given complimentary tickets for each game which can be sold or given to friends.

They are provided with free travel uniforms -- slacks and sport coats.

They are furnished free Christmas holiday air travel from the campus to their homes or they are given free use of automobiles to go home between semesters.

If they are physically immature or poorly prepared in the fundamentals of the sport, they are held out of varsity competition during the sophomore year in order to become older, bigger and stronger and have three years of varsity competition, even though this means attending college for five years.
5. Some colleges are known for changing grades in the Registrar's Office in order to make athletes eligible and for rigging classroom attendance records for the benefit of athletes.

6. The desire to win often causes coaches to risk playing a student who has not fully recovered from a serious internal injury or a fractured bone. Winning the game is far more important than the welfare of the student.
7. Last fall or winter it was revealed that many college football stars had signed to play professional football even before the season started or during the season or before playing in year-end college bowl games. In the torrent of discussion that ensued, it also came to light that possibly 200 assistant college coaches were on professional football payrolls as scouts to furnish extensive information on players and to induce players to sign with a particular team.

These are some, not all, of the practices and policies which have accompanied the growth of intercollegiate athletics. They permeate the intercollegiate athletic structure and system. In following some of these practices, colleges and universities are not violating any rule of an athletic governing association or conference but in others, they are, and often they are caught and penalized. But legal or illegal, it is incredible that colleges and universities are parties to such questionable practices which negate the very ideals and values for which they stand. In so doing, they have set a low moral and ethical standard for the students whom they teach.

I would like to point out at least two major effects of these unnatural pressures upon colleges and universities and athletes.

1. Ever since 1945 there have been periodic scandals among college and university players involving cheating, bribery and dishonesty; they have accepted bribes to fix and throw games. The last scandal occurred early in 1965 when 109 cadets, including about thirty members of the football team, at the U. S. Air Force Academy resigned or were dismissed from the Academy and the Air Force for cheating on examinations or for knowing about the cheating and not reporting it. Forty-four percent of those on the football squad, who were dismissed, were "recruited athletes." A recent study by Columbia University on cheating in college pointed out that: "Despite angry denials by coaches and football-minded alumni, the dishonesty among athletes is staggeringly high." According to Arthur Daley, Sports Editor of The New York Times: "The colleges teach them how to cheat even before the kids have left high school."

2. Unlike other faculty members and contrary to what is considered sound educational practice, many coaches are employed on a contract basis and not on the same basis as other faculty members. Another and even more important deviation is the payment of higher salaries to athletic coaches than those paid to other members of the faculty. After the close of the football season last fall, numerous universities appointed new football coaches. Five of these were reported to be receiving base salaries of \$16,000, \$18,500, \$22,500, \$25,000, and \$35,000 plus lucrative benefits. I recently checked the 1966 AAUP report on faculty salaries at these same five universities. I found that where the average compensation for all full-time faculty members was \$10,871, the coach got \$16,000; where it was \$13,014, the coach got \$18,500; where it was \$9,348, the coach got \$22,500; where it was \$10,357, the coach got \$25,000; and where it was \$9,435, the coach got \$35,000. How can an educational institution possibly justify placing such a premium on the services of a football coach over all other faculty members?

I would like to close on a constructive note and suggest some measures that might improve the general situation. They may seem idealistic and impractical but drastic measures are needed if intercollegiate athletics are to be conducted in accord with sound educational principles.

1. College presidents, deans and faculties must assert greater control over athletic coaches and athletic policies, speak out loud and clear against questionable practices, and assume greater leadership in bringing about reforms. This leadership is at present conspicuously lacking. College and university presidents are not hesitant about speaking out loud and clear and using their influence and power on other major educational problems and even on national and international issues. But they are strangely silent on the subject of intercollegiate athletics.

As for college faculties, they discuss, complain and condemn in private conversation what is being done in intercollegiate athletics in the name of higher education. But how many faculty members in this audience ever attended a faculty meeting where intercollegiate athletics were the subject for any thorough and prolonged discussion such as is given to other major educational problems? Faculty members seem to acquiesce in and approve of what is being done. They, too, remain strangely silent on the subject.

I want to say here that I congratulate this Association for placing this subject on its program at this time. I wish more professional associations, including the College Presidents' Association, would do the same thing.

2. Individual colleges, athletic conferences and athletic associations could, if they wished, require that financial aid be awarded on the basis of financial need. The use of the College Scholarship Service to determine financial need has spread, become more widely used, and is the best available method for determining financial need. Recently, our Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference adopted a rule that the members would not exceed the amount of financial aid to a student athlete as recommended by the College Scholarship Service. Other athletic conferences could do the same.

3. Individual colleges, athletic conferences and athletic associations could, if they wished, require that eligibility rules for financial aid be the same for all students, athletes and non-athletes, and thus eliminate the preferential treatment now given to athletes.

4. Colleges and universities could, if they wished, stop coaches from roaming the country -- and Canada -- to recruit athletes and confine them to the limits of the campus. This would help reduce the wild recruiting that now takes place all across the country.

5. If intercollegiate athletics and physical education are an integral part of the educational program and are good, then, for the public colleges, state legislatures should appropriate funds for their support just as they do for all other parts of the educational program. This would remove the need for state colleges and universities to depend upon gate receipts and television contracts for funds to finance the athletic and physical education program.

6. Finally, since intercollegiate athletics have become a big business for the purpose of entertaining the general public and making money to finance the athletic and physical education program of colleges and universities, the Internal Revenue Service of the United States could, with good reason, greatly deflate the present trend in all colleges by declaring that gate receipts from all intercollegiate athletic contests are taxable income.

Thank you.



CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, President Giddens. This is a challenge that needs to be picked up, I am sure.

Next we would like to present to you the Ivy League view, and to do this we have Mr. Jeremiah Ford, Director of Athletics at Pennsylvania. Mr. Ford.

MR. JEREMIAH FORD (Director of Athletics, University of Pennsylvania): Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Panelists, Members of the Conference:

When college presidents are asked, "What is the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education?" they reply in stentorian chorus that athletics are education. For proof they point out that students perform in college athletic programs and that employees of educational institutions supervise these programs.

At this point most presidents take to the hills and are heard from no more. The perilous task of laboring in fields so thinly sown is left to us -- the administrators of college athletics. Engaging in our own directionless husbandry to bring off the harvest on schedule we look for help and protection from many quarters, but rarely find the kind and quantity we want.

The faculties to whom we naturally turn as the watchdogs over our enterprise are for the most part not much help or protection to us. They tolerate our programs but only as healthful recreation for the student in a university's extracurriculum. Beyond this point they usually abandon us, particularly in our attempts to find a welcome place on the college budget as education. In the twilight zone of education to which they relegate our athletic programs they rarely see the thief when he comes and never bark until the thief has carried off our harvest.

Alumni, the general public, public officials, and even the school treasurer are watchdogs too, but watchdogs of another sort. They bark often and loud and for reasons different from those of the faculty. Their barking sets up pressures, which, like it or no, all of us have working on our programs. In the sense that these pressures keep our programs viable by challenging our assumptions and our management they are good for us.

As peripheral considerations they do not alarm me. But I view with trepidation the proposition inherent in them that the main chance of intercollegiate athletics is something other than education. As

entertainment or anything other than education I frankly do not see how intercollegiate athletics can survive on a national scale.

I believe this so deeply that I am compelled to leave you a jeremiad today that bears a two sided prophecy of doom. One side says that those of us who are presently hawking our wares in the entertainment market place are doomed to fail for two reasons. First, because faculties cannot let us jeopardize institutional integrity much longer in the educationally arid entertainment business. And secondly, because such a market place places little value on educational furbelows. The other side predicts the national demise of the intercollegiate athletics we know today as a consequence of our collective failures in the market place.

So what do we do? What do we do in a national effort, that is, to gain local acceptance for our programs and insure the survival of intercollegiate athletics as a national custom? Let's look today at some alternatives and appraise the hope they hold for us.

(1) We can give up intercollegiate athletics as we know them today and avoid our problem, or

(2) We can jump into the entertainment market place, feet first, fight each other and the pros for the entertainment dollar, and await the slow economic attrition that must eventually take us all out of business, or

(3) We can make intercollegiate athletics a bona fide educational experience for our undergraduates, or

(4) We can choose up sides based on the above alternatives and solemnly promise to let the other fellow go his merry way.

Let us look at the first alternative, the one that suggests we give up intercollegiate athletics.

We couldn't banish intercollegiate athletics even if we wanted to. Our undergraduates would not let us because their need for an athletic experience, in or out of college, is compulsive -- it is indigenous to our culture and antedates their need for an intellectual experience. The folklore and epic literature of western man substantiate a claim that an immemorial urge is or has been on all of us to emulate folk heroes such as: Richard coeur de Lion, Beowulf, Siegfried, Odysseus, Roland, and Cuchulain. They or elements of their characters are the warp and woof of

our cultural heritage. True, some were intellectuals, but all were warriors or athletes, interchangeable terms for supermen of brawn. They were the jocks of legend (laughter) -- the jocks who antedated jock straps. (Laughter) The demi-urge these heroes symbolize in our culture holds modern youth captive. Nothing we do can change this basic cultural pattern. To reduce this analogy to utter corn I must observe that we can take the boy out of athletics but we can't take athletics out of the boy.

Alternative #2 follows closely after #1 because since we, according to my rationale, cannot ban athletics we must restrict our programs or put them to profitable use.

No institution has confined its athletics, even to an intramural program, with much success. Most programs so restricted usually emerge again as intercollegiate because the undergraduate not only has to flex his muscles in competition with the best but with the best from extramural opposition. Contests such as those between intramural teams from Harvard and Yale are a case in point. They provide the classical example of intramurals gone intercollegiate and explain the genesis, probably, of intercollegiate athletics in America. Isn't it obvious then that once we have athletics we are going to have intercollegiate athletics whether we want them or not.

"So," we ask, "why resist the inevitable when it can be put to some use?" The question is, and here we come back to alternative #2, "What is the use or uses we can make of our intercollegiate programs?"

Make no mistake; the entertainment market place calls strongly to all of us, saint and sinner alike. Many who have the conservation of educational funds on their consciences answer the call. And many who don't also answer the call. But all who respond for any reason must eventually answer budgetary questions such as the following: "Who of us can honestly prove profit from competition in this market place after a cost accounting is made of: scholarships for athletes, the recruiting of same by a whole elaborate retinue of coaches, bird dogs and talent scouts, and the expenses of promotion, public relations, and hoopla?" And "What happens to profits when our programs expand into such non-income sports as crew, golf, fencing, squash, sailing, etc.?"

But cruelest of all, after answers to the above show how illusory these profits are, is the question, "Isn't it true that the pros with their

dollar morality condition the ethics of this market place?"

It would seem when answers to these questions are analyzed that a case of institutional paranoia rather than a pot of gold awaits all of us who tarry at the market place in competition with the pros. But tarry we do and compete with them we do. This fact plus the fact that we climb over each other for our own special plums cause most of the abuses we deplore in college athletics today.

As a result we all must wear those legislative hair shirts that the N.C.A.A. periodically weaves on its looms. A courtier from a Better Business Bureau could have designed the shirts for us. But no. Employees of educational institutions such as yours and mine styled them to our silhouettes and discomfort.

There is no logic in the legislation. It begs the question. From its premises it quite clearly infers that all of us who try to make money in sports have subscribed to double standards -- one standard of admissions and financial aid for athletes and another for non-athletes. The market place mentality that conceived the legislation asserts that what is right for those of us working in the market place is right for those of us working outside the market place. Your institution and mine, and not the N.C.A.A., must decide how valid these inferences are for us. For some of us they are perfectly valid. For others, no.

We, or those of us who reject a market place rationale and the attendant legislation, must consider then with some hope my third alternative: the proposal that athletics be exploited for their potential as education.

To engineer consent for the concept that athletics are in fact education we must first argue down the traditional opposition from faculties. It won't be easy, but it might well be worth the try for reasons that transcend the cause of athletics as education if we can dislodge a few departmental apologists from the idee fixe that education is the exclusive province of the classroom in general and their own classrooms in particular.

For the benefit of those faculty members who require full blown persuasion that athletics can be education I would argue with more fancy than logic that:

All Johnny undergrad, like Gaul, is divided into three parts. In one part he is scholar; in

another, athlete; in the third, playboy. In all three parts he is educable; maybe not equally, but educable, nevertheless.

Even so, most faculties accept only the responsibility for Johnny's education as a scholar. They tolerate him with regulation as an athlete and consign him the task of tutoring himself in the arts of recreation under the paternal scrutiny of the Dean of Men.

I can only guess why those faculties who plan Johnny's undergraduate life should orient his education so strictly to the classroom. But it would seem incongruous that they should fail in such wholesale fashion to exploit all other opportunities to educate Johnny.

We have already made elaborate provisions to take care of Johnny as a scholar. As a playboy, or recreationist, he must be planned for, too, though not in this panel discussion. But I can venture the observation here that in the ideal community I would project for Johnny undergrad the scholar and athlete in him will so use up his dedication that the playboy will be hard pressed to find time for even a judicious vice.

In the Ivy Group and institutions of like persuasion, he has had some attention paid to him as an athlete. Steps have been taken to protect us from him and him from the world. One might say we have deodorized him, decommercialized his arena, and chosen for him his peer group -- the group in which we can hate enough to beat each other but trust enough to schedule each other.

But even in our rarified atmosphere more must be done to educate him through his athletic experiences. We have to change an institutional attitude here and there, and eliminate a whole series of outmoded regulations and procedures to realize the full promise of an Ivy president's official statement, "Participation in athletic competition is appropriately a part of the American educational process."

With such an object in view the following actions therefore seem to be in order not only for the Ivies but for all institutions that desire to describe athletics in their catalogues as education, with or without course credit:

- (1) Choose and evaluate coaches on the same basis as faculty members. Grant coaches faculty tenure in line with faculty practice or a series of contracts leading up to a contract for life. Stop sending coaches to the salt mines because their halfbacks fumble away victories on the goal line.

(2) Roster athletic practice periods during the day when all members of squads can meet for organized practice sessions.

(3) Eliminate ineligibility as a result of scholastic or social probation.

(4) Eliminate from our national, regional and conference legislation all rules which mock our claims that athletics are education. Rules such as the transfer and letter of intent do just this. They support the proprietary rights of the party of the first part, the colleges, to the presence, at least, of the party of the second part, the athlete, at their institutions. But the party of the second part, the athlete, is spared complete peonage by other quasi-legal devices such as the "grant-in-aid" or the athletic scholarship that guarantee him certain emoluments for services which he is morally obligated, if not legally required, to render. And official interpretations of the grant-in-aid and athletic scholarship legislation guarantee fair employment practices for the party of the second part, the student. But these are presently suspect with many parties of the first part, the colleges, as being bad business arrangements.

Most of this legislation, except the transfer rule, that venerable anachronism, is unacceptable to institutions who find assumptions in it that athletics are outside the mainstream of the educational enterprise. As a consequence they ignore it and they in turn are ignored by those devotees of the legislation who do not compete against them in the market place. "So," we ask, "why do they fret when no one, including themselves, applies the legislation to them?"

Well, running through all this legislation, the legislature on recruiting, and more recently 1.6 legislation, is a womb to tomb concern for a party of the second part none of them have ever seen on their campuses. But according to the N.C.A.A. he is there and everywhere. Apparently he just evolved through genus homo sapiens and genus studentis and emerged full blown as genus student-athlete. Since the Romans did not have a name for him I use the N.C.A.A.'s.

As genus student-athlete he is aided, admitted, protected, and exploited according to tightly prescribed rules. He is every athlete in our schools who receives financial aid whether he needs it or not and none of the athletes in our schools who are not aided. He is the creation and convenience of those of us who are committed to the entertainment market place. Concern for him is the pious fiction of our national

legislation, and competition for him generates the massive distrust we bear each other on a national scale. Because he is the fellow we depend on, more than coaches and cheering sections, to gain us those financial rewards in the entertainment market place, we predicate most of our athletic legislation on his existence.

All rules governing the student-athlete-college relationships are an impertinence to the majority of us who neither need to distrust nor to be distrusted in his behalf. We find that they are appropriate only for those who stake out claims in the market place. And even here they would seem to be rather fatuous in that they put the colleges in short pants in competition against the pros for the spectator dollar.

Our fourth alternative, the recommendation that we choose up sides and go our merry ways might relieve all of us of genus student-athlete and allow us to live again at peace with each other. For those who take athletics into education genus student-athlete would thus cease to be an anomaly. For those who take athletics into the market place he would cease to be an impediment. But for the present we still do not have to live in separate dormitories because of him -- separate rooms will do. The important thing is that we both promise not to burn the dormitory down. With such a thought in mind we must always predicate our national legislation on this "same dormitory but separate rooms" accommodation for the country's intercollegiate athletics.

Choices important for ourselves and for the survival of the country's intercollegiate athletics have to be made. As we go our separate ways, hopefully these choices will be made from a single dormitory sanctuary -- the N.C.A.A.

If the conclusion is valid that the last best hope for intercollegiate athletics lies with institutions who not only use but accept athletics as education, then the N.C.A.A. will be well advised to accommodate all such institutions. These institutions will perpetuate intercollegiate athletics and possibly, the N.C.A.A. All accommodations provided to date by the N.C.A.A. seem specifically designed for those who endanger intercollegiate athletics in the wastelands of the entertainment industry. They cannot be expected to perpetuate intercollegiate athletics and possibly not the N.C.A.A.

In summary then I repeat a theme attributed to college presidents in my introduction: the role of Intercollegiate Athletics in higher education is education. If we are faculty people we are fools not to use

athletics as such. If we are athletic people our programs are doomed if we don't use them as such.

Jeremiah leaves you with this prophecy and these instructions in husbandry. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Mr. Ford.

With this challenge -- if you are not running to the hills -- let us see if someone has some questions they would like to place to the panelists. We ask that you stand and identify yourselves for the purposes of record keeping. Are there questions?

DIRECTOR PAUL GINSBERG (University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin): With the record we have against Ohio State on the West Coast, I would like to hear some defense or explanation from the gentleman on the right as to their justification as to a different academic standard required for athletes, as opposed to those who merely want to be a president of a student association. The latter are required to maintain a 2. average; the former are not. I would like to hear some explanation of their defense of these varying academic standards.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: To whom do you wish to direct the question?

DIRECTOR GINSBERG: To any member on your left.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does anybody want to pick up the challenge? Mr. Larkins, from Ohio State.

MR. LARKINS: I will do it only because you mentioned Ohio State University.

At Ohio State University in the Western Conference, of which the University of Wisconsin is a part, you have an academic level of 1.7 for grant-in-aid. At Ohio State, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 2.0 progressively for eligibility for the major activities -- I think you mentioned president of the student body or senate. It is a 2.0.

I would say basically I would have no defense of the differentiation. That may not answer your question, but I personally feel that they ought to be the same. And if the student president must maintain a 2.0, I think the student athlete has the same obligation. So I cannot defend that. I have to agree that there should not be the differentiation.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Mr. Larkins.



FATHER TOM McCALL (Fordham University): Do any of the large groups, such as the N.C.A.A., have any code of conduct for these coaches that jump contracts? I am not thinking so much of the coach, as let us say the case of the one who just left the Military Academy; but I am thinking of the students who are solicited by these coaches, who go to a university in hopes of being trained by this particular coach, and then the coach leaves these boys. We have this year of ineligibility following that, so let us say he is losing now two years of training under this coach. I am thinking of the student himself, a boy who goes a great distance from one part of the country to another, only to find when he arrives that the coach who asked him to come is no longer the coach there.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let us ask Dean Smiley, from the Colorado School of Mines, who is the secretary of N.C.A.A. to answer that question.

DEAN SMILEY: There is no specific legislation or code spelled out in the National Collegiate Athletic Association rules, nor in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic rules. But the Coaches Association has some standards, and in the back of the NCAA book are some suggested standards for coaches. There is no implementation for this specifically.

Perhaps Dick Larkins would like to embellish this, if I have not covered it properly.

MR. LARKINS: You did a fine job.

DR. GIDDENS: Could I say a word on that. This applies to faculty members who are not coaches. You have the same trouble with faculty members who come down and jump you in June, do you not? So let us not single out the coaches. I think one cure for this -- I am not sure, but it seems to me a few years ago the University of Wyoming employed a coach on a five year contract, and said they would pay him in full if he stayed the five years, and if he did not they would reduce the salary by x-thousand dollars. I think that was the most effective. (Laughter)

FATHER McCALL: My feeling is that all the penalties are against the student, whether the boy is aware of these regulations, he is declared ineligible. Nobody else concerned ever has the onus that is put on the boy, and if we are going to be interested in the students, then I think we should either remove some of these restrictions and not put the full weight of the law upon the students, or waive these

in some way, or suspend sentence or judgment and not leave the boy of 18 or 19 sort of abandoned by all the adults that are on the scene.

DEAN SMILEY: There are some rules that will preclude the eligibility of a particular student. Dick Balch has mentioned some of them. But in the main the infractions are investigated on an institutional basis and the institutions are penalized within the NCAA, rather than the individual student athlete.

Now we depend upon the Directors of Athletics and the coaches of the sports, and the faculty athletic representatives to get the word to the students about these rules. We also have to depend upon the high school coaches as well. This is one of our problems, communications.

There are attempts, sincere attempts to do this. It is not as effective as it might be or as we would like it to be, but it is not neglected.

DEAN ARLEIGH WILLIAMS: I would like to ask Jerry Ford a question which I think hits at this very thing. I think you suggested that we ought to do away with all eligibility requirements. Why did you do that?

MR. FORD: May I read that part of my speech that I cut out? (Laughter) I hope I can find it. I cut the defensive -- this proposition out of my original speech because it ran to 25 minutes, instead of 23 minutes that I used, so if you will bear with me, I will give you my reasons again that are tied pretty close to Johnny undergrad. Why eliminate ineligibility as a result of scholastic or social probation? Well, because no one except Johnny undergrad can decide for him which of his educational experiences is less important; and no one should, since part of Johnny's education comes from making choices among values.

Yet currently, if Johnny goes on academic probation, those who would not presume to recommend that he give up his favorite course in poetry have no hesitancy in requiring him to give up his football. This is done despite the fact that no one can demonstrate to Johnny that his poetry course had more educational value than his football. Not even Johnny can do this.

Social probation also denies Johnny the educational and sometimes therapeutic benefits of inter-collegiate athletics, often to his detriment, and that of the team he represents; and with less justification

than academic probation since it punishes the athlete as a pariah to the community he serves. Besides, his punishment is no more adult than standing in the corner, giving up dessert, and writing one's offense on the blackboard 100 times. If Johnny is truly unregenerate, he should be sent to the school psychiatrist, or forced to leave the community, but while he is a member of the undergraduate community he should not be denied any educational rights or privileges of that community, social or academic probation notwithstanding.

This is predicated on the idea that the athletic experience is going to be made a bona fide educational experience.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you, Mr. Ford.

Mr. Smiley has a comment.

DEAN SMILEY: Could I make a response here?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD (Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois): I want to ask the President of Hamline why he indicated a restriction of where coaches could recruit athletes.

DR. GIDDENS: Well, this is simply part of the wild recruiting process that is going on across the country. I merely suggested that as one means of reducing -- not completely solving, but reducing, along with other measures that I suggested, for ameliorating the situation.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD: In response, I would say we would not think of restricting the recruitment of students for Northwestern University to the State of Illinois.

DR. GIDDENS: I did not say students, I said athletes.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD: Or athletes. They are students basically so you recruit them from anywhere.

DR. GIDDENS: On the other hand, we have an admissions staff. I do not know what you have at Northwestern.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD: We have a good one.

DR. GIDDENS: They go out across the country, clear across. This is their function.

DEAN McLEOD: And they are bird dogging for students. Isn't it all right to bird dog for athletes?

DR. GIDDENS: Yes.

DEAN McLEOD: Who are students?

DR. GIDDENS: Yes. Our admissions staff, like any other, interviews students with all kinds of interests. But the admissions staff is not out there offering them inducements of this nature. I think there is a distinction here, where the pressure is on for athletes, rather than for non-athletic students.

DEAN McLEOD: I do not want to carry on a Socratic dialog, but I would say the Ivy League and many private institutions compete very strongly for the best students in all the institutions they can across the country, and will bid for them.

DR. GIDDENS: That is true. That is one of the biggest racketeering things that we have in the country. (Laughter)

DEAN McLEOD: I think I have made my point.

DEAN SAM BASTA (University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada): I would like to direct my question to President Giddens. I think all of us recognize that there is an ulcerated pimple on the universities relative to intercollegiate athletics. I would like to pose this question: Recognizing that universities and colleges do have this ulcerated pimple, why have not the presidents of the universities done something about it?

DR. GIDDENS: Well, this is what I am advocating. I was glad to accept your invitation to come here to talk about this problem. I have talked about it before, at home. I have acted at home. And I cannot account for the others not doing this. You have some guesses, I am sure.

DEAN BASTA: Yes, I do.

DEAN RICHARD WOTRUBA (Holy Cross): The poor president here is getting pinpointed. I was wondering why you drew the analogy between the coaches' salaries and the faculty? Why didn't you draw the analogy with the full professors? The coaches are specialists, in other words.

DR. GIDDENS: I can show the same thing if you took the professors' salaries on the AUP report. It is broken down into the average for the full professors, associates, assistant professors, and instructors.

I took the over-all average for full time college professors in these institutions.

DEAN WOTRUBA: Did you take into account the number of hours that are put in by the coaches, in comparison to professors?

DR. GIDDENS: All right, I will go over the AUP definition. They make the definition. That is the best I can answer it. I just take the basis that they make the study on and report it to the public, and you know what it is.

DEAN REGINALD D. ROOT (University of Washington, Seattle, Washington): As a person who coached football twenty-six years and taught economics, the classroom is not much different from the playing field but you will find that the poor coach, you cannot let him survive; but the poor faculty member, with his tenure, survives forever. But you just cannot let a poor coach hang around too long. You just cannot.

DR. GIDDENS: Why not?

DEAN ROOT: The poor faculty member, you have no test of his students. He gives the exam and if he wants to flunk half of them, he says, well, they were not good. But the poor coach who does not happen to have sufficient material to carry out his task that year, he cannot flunk those students; he flunks himself. I do not think the two positions are comparable at all.

DR. GIDDENS: On the other hand, as I implied, and as Mr. Ford said, I think we are both advocating putting coaches on the same basis as other faculty members.

DEAN ROOT: Well, I think you might be able to do it if you got out of the gate receipt area. If you want to clear the evils of intercollegiate football, charge fifty cents a game. Where you have not been able to accumulate gate receipts you have stayed amateur. This was true of basketball years ago. But I do not think you can ever have a coach on tenure because you just cannot have a poor coach around, and you can have a lot of lousy faculty members around. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do you want to answer that, Mr. Giddens? I'm sure you can.

DEAN ROOT: Another point I want to make, (laughter) is that I have a kid playing football. You ask him to come back August 31, and he has to give up a good job to go back to school, and he trains and

gets ready and plays two games before school opens. So actually he gives up a month of earning capacity to do something for his school. And he does do something for his school, a lot of the things that Tom Hamilton mentioned, and others have mentioned.

DR. GIDDENS: Are you talking about the student or the coach?

DEAN ROOT: I am talking about the boy -- back to the boy now. He gives up the full month of September to work for his institution.

DR. GIDDENS: All right, as a faculty member there have been things that I have wanted to do, for which I have had to pay a price because I wanted to do it. I think that probably there ought to be this kind of an element in the student's make-up, that if this is his greatest desire, and if he wants to do it, he ought to pay a price for it.

DEAN ROOT: If he is a poor student, he gives up a months employment in which he might make \$500.00 or whatever he is getting at a summer job to get back to school and do this for his school.

DR. GIDDENS: Yes.

DEAN ROOT: So I have a new proposal. Why don't we just pay football players as employees of the university? (Laughter)

DR. GIDDENS: That is what we are doing now.

DEAN ROOT: No we are not, not exactly.

DEAN LOUIS C. STAMATAKOS (Grand Valley State College, Allendale, Michigan): In your infinite wisdom and experience, I would like a response from any panelist, in terms of advice to a brand new institution, knowing full and well all the evils and some of the benefits of intercollegiate athletics, what would you advise a new institution to do? Assume that you were in command and had the opportunity to make the decision with respect to developing an intercollegiate athletic program?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: You want to take that one on, Arleigh?

MR. LARKINS: I will take that one on. I do not know why I take these assignments, but you have a good question. This is one man's opinion. I would stay completely away from intercollegiate athletics.

DEAN STAMATAKOS: Will you let my president know that?

MR. LARKINS: Wait a minute. I have not finished. You stay away from intercollegiate athletics. If you believe in a sound fitness program, you will establish a fine intramural program. You will never have to worry about an intercollegiate program because it will develop in spite of you. And it will develop gradually. You do not have to superimpose that program at the moment. These kids are aggressive. You provide them with an intramural program and your intercollegiate program will develop just like a kid growing up. And you can control it, but you do not do it by throwing it at them.

DR. BALCH: Let me add to that. Having just spent two years with your problem of starting a university, first of all, you are not going to have the choice as far as your president goes. It is going to be shoved down your throat. I suggest that in starting a program that you bring the coaches into the faculty, make them a part of the Dean of Students staff, if you will -- at least on an informal basis, if you cannot do it formally -- have them feed back to the faculty the insights they gain about students, whether it be on an intramural program or intercollegiate program, and get rid of this circular argument I have just heard President Giddens carrying on, and from the floor. That involves, in my judgment, a denial of everything that has been said here today, and a denial, as a former member of your organization, of what we have talked about, to my knowledge, for the last twenty years.

We have always paid lip service in NASPA, or when it was NADAM, to the idea that here was the athletic program and it was really none of our business. It is a whole lot of your business. You can gain great status within your own institution, both personally and as a staff, if you will go about this in terms of acceptance of coaches as a part of the faculty, a part of your staff, who then can give written messages, if need be, written reports for your personnel files that really give a basic understanding of what students are, and why they are in college.

This is not theory. I personally carried it on at M.I.T. and started at Irvine this past couple of years. But I would like to see you become more involved in what I laughingly now allude to as student personnel administrators. You don't "administer" students to start with. It is a bad name. If you get involved in reaching out into the faculty and stop looking at yourselves as the specialist who is the

only one who knows students, then you will reach to the coaches, first of all, as many of you have, on an informal basis, but don't continue this same palaver that I can remember back in 1947 of what are we? What are we doing as administrators of student personnel programs? And broaden the base that provides for faculty, provides for athletic coaches, if they are not given faculty status, and make them a part of your team. This succeeds.

ADMIRAL HAMILTON: I have a letter here which I think is pertinent to your question about the image of an institution, and this letter was written by Lawrence Kimpton, a former president of the University of Chicago, to Leo Harris, Director of Athletics at Oregon. "The University of Chicago, as you know, abandoned intercollegiate football in 1939, with a tremendous amount of publicity. For a number of years thereafter it seemed to attract young people who did not like athletics or sports of any kind. This situation applies today to a certain extent.

"My point here is that the young person who selects an institution of higher education because it does not play football is a very odd youngster. Perhaps I would add to this, that while most geniuses are odd, by no means are all odd people geniuses. I think that this situation has been partially corrected at the University of Chicago, but it has taken a very long time and it is still a problem.

"I suppose all that I am saying is that healthy, normal, well adjusted young Americans enjoy intercollegiate competition, either as participants or spectators. An institution that does not have them acts as a kind of a magnet to attract the mal-adjusted, social misfit, and it just so happens that this type is very often not a particularly superior student. Even if he sometimes is, he is made ineffective by his inability to get on in a normal society." Lawrence Kimpton.

DEAN DEWEY L. NEWMAN (University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho): I had a question a moment ago, and I think it is partly answered, in this solution to the relationship to the student personnel staff and the athletics department, as it were.

What I wonder is, using a pedantic term, why do we put athletics so far away from the rest -- and again this term -- of the co-curricular of the university? Why is this such a special type student who participates in athletics? Of course, he has a certain amount of athletic ability, and we know all these abilities are in the normal curve. Why is he



so different from all this group? I think that would give responsibility to us, as another part of our program, for the whole student body.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Some of you who may have to leave, do not forget to leave your evaluation card.

Let us ask Dean Smiley to answer that question.

DEAN SMILEY: Thank you. As was mentioned before, this is a personal answer, but I think the athlete is a special person on the campus in many respects because he gets a lot of special attention, which he needs to pursue the purpose of athletics, and that is to represent the institution. If he represents it especially well he gets newspaper coverage, he gets TV coverage, he gets all of this. When the pressure of oboe players gets to the same place as the pressure for halfbacks we will have to have national associations trying to regulate this activity too. These are some of the reasons that make these people special.

Now there is another one that I do not think is recognized, and that is, there is a very special rapport between the athlete and his coach. It is a rapport that I think deans of students should be jealous of. The athlete will probably get a great deal more of his counsel from his coach than he will ever get from the counseling services of the university. This makes him special.

Now may I come back with a question: Should the counseling people, the deans of students and the others, be more cognizant of this special rapport that the athlete has with his coach, and work with the coaches to see that they understand what they are doing?

If a boy goes astray and breaks the rules, it is usually that he has been ill-advised, or maliciously advised. And I regret to use that term, but it has happened. Now, where do the coaches come in? The coaches come from your institutions where you train them in the art of coaching. I think this is the place to start.

May I leave that as a question, maybe not to be answered at this time, but to be answered ultimately.

DEAN DEWEY L. NEWMAN (University of Idaho): My point is that this is, in spite of the television image of the student, of the athlete, he is not a

gladiator; he is just another kid who has the same problems as the rest of the kids on campus, and maybe more problems because of these things. I am not blaming the coaches, because most of my best friends are coaches. I think maybe it is our fault that we say, "this is the coach's problem over here," or something. This problem may have developed by our ignoring it, by default.

DEAN GEORGE A. YOURICK, Jr., (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas): I would like to make a comment regarding this rapport comment which was made a moment ago. I think rapport should be able to be established in the case of a football team that I know of where there are some 15 or 17 coaches for one football team. This is pretty good staff coverage, for part of the student body.

REV. BRO. JOHN E. DALY (Iona College, New Rochelle, New York): I would like to ask Dean Smiley if the NCAA has taken any cognizance of this club football movement which is -- I will not say we are plagued with it, but we have it.

DEAN SMILEY: We know it is going on. We highly approve of it as a way for the students to express themselves athletically. But officially it is without our particular organization and does not have any particular part in it. They may use our rules, and things of that sort, but it is not represented in the NCAA, or in the NEIA, as such. It is strictly between the institutions involved, or within the institution.

DEAN WILLIAMS: I have a comment. I am still concerned about the question about this specialization, of treating athletes as special people. I have strong feelings about this. I think the greatest contribution we can make to the athlete is to help him learn that he is not special. The sooner we can help him learn that, the sooner he is going to grow up. I am saying this as an old jock. (Laughter)

DEAN ALLAN W. RODGERS (Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana): I was wondering, in terms of eligibility, how Mr. Ford feels related to the coach's rules for eligibility. He was suggesting that there not be scholastic eligibility or there not be social eligibility to represent the university. How would he carry this on in terms of coaches establishing some kinds of eligibility which do not necessarily reflect on his playing ability on Saturday, but does as to practice, training rules, and so forth.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Mr. Ford, do you wish to answer that question?

MR. FORD: I am not too sure I can answer your question, but let me say this, that I think the coach, again, is the counselor for the athlete, and if he is truly interested in his orderly progress toward graduation, can deny him practice or curtail his practice, if he is getting in scholastic difficulty, and even threaten not to play him in a game. Does that get to your question?

DEAN RODGERS: I was wondering what type of eligibility the coach should establish, and then if the student violates whatever this eligibility is, how does this get to your former comments that there should not be all university eligibility?

MR. FORD: I would back the coach. If the coach says, if you drink you cannot be on the squad, I would think this is a discipline of the course. This is like a course and obviously when you take an examination or violate the discipline of a course, you have to suffer for it. I do not think one has to do with the other. I think you are trying to establish an analogy which I do not think exists between my statement that you ought to eliminate ineligibility based on social and academic probation, and your feeling that since the student makes the choice then he ought to make the choice as to whether or not he can violate the coach's own particular rules and play. I do not think he should. I do not think he should be allowed that privilege. I may be inconsistent.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let us take one more question.

DEAN JAMES C. McLEOD (Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois): I want to ask a question which may clarify this one. Mr. Ford, is it true that a student, if he is enrolled in the University of Pennsylvania, even though he be academically below the grades and though he be on social probation, he could still play football?

MR. FORD: I have never been able to convince anybody at Pennsylvania that I am right on this score. Pennsylvania would disavow me, as the exponent of this particular theory.

I think Princeton has approached this problem --

DEAN McLEOD: They do.

MR. FORD: -- in the following way. After freshman year, I believe it is, you cannot go on academic probation unless it is something very seriously

wrong with the performance. Harvard tried eliminating ineligibility based on academic and social probation a number of years ago, but chickened out, simply because the parents got in the act and they said, "How dare you play Junior if Junior is having a bad time in his studies!" They chickened out, not because this was educationally unsound, but because of the pressure that mamma and papa, who were footing the bill, put on them.

DEAN SMILEY: May I make an observation on this subject of eligibility? There is a philosophy that to represent your institution in one way or another is a privilege and not a right, and a privilege must be earned. And this is part of the philosophy behind establishing eligibility. You earn the right to represent your institution.

There is a strongly held contrary view which Mr. Ford has very ably put before you, but the contrary view is held by some also.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I think our time has really run out here. The members of the panel have agreed that they would be willing to stay for a moment or two and answer questions that you may have, individually. For example, some of you may wish to query Dean Smiley with regard to the 1.6 rule, if you do not understand this and you have questions for the 1.6 rule for eligibility.

On behalf of the audience and the Association, I would like to thank each and every member of the panel for taking the time out of their very busy schedules to fly to Seattle and meet with us to discuss this very important issue, and I hope seriously that it leads to something that will improve our programs and thereby improve the kinds of experiences that our students have in our universities.

Thank you. (Applause)

... The Seminar recessed at four-thirty o'clock ...

SEMINAR

Tuesday - June 28, 1966

"The Student Personnel Administrator as Educator:  
Alcohol Education"

The Seminar on "The Student Personnel Administrator as Educator: Alcohol Education" was held in the Williamsburg Room, beginning at two o'clock, Dean David W. Robinson, Dean of Student Affairs, Emory University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Good afternoon. This is Seminar 3, "The Student Personnel Administrator as Educator." Particular attention will be on the subject of alcohol education. We will have two and a half speakers this afternoon -- Mr. Dimas, Dr. Bruyn, and then I will follow up with a brief statement. The order of presentation will be Mr. Dimas first, then Dr. Bruyn.

My design, other than that of presiding, will be to share with you what the Association has done this past year, and what it plans to do next year on the subject of alcohol education.

George Dimas is the Director, State of Oregon Mental Health Division, Alcohol Studies and Rehabilitation Center. He is the gentleman who is on your far left.

Mr. Dimas is a graduate of Westminster College, graduate work and degree at the University of Utah. Further graduate work at Columbia and DePaul Universities.

I will not recite all of his articles, all of his research work, but note only that he has been the president and past vice president, secretary-treasurer of the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs.

Dr. Henry Bruyn, who is between Mr. Dimas and myself, many of you met yesterday at the drug abuse presentation. Dr. Bruyn is a graduate of Amherst, medical degree from Yale University. He is the associate professor of the Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, San Francisco, and is also director of the student health program, University of California, Berkeley.

Reference will be made in Dr. Bruyn's presentation and mine about a workshop on alcohol, literally entitled "Alcohol and the College Youth,"

which was conducted under Dr. Bruyn's direction one year ago this month at Lake Tahoe. This particular presentation was written up and copies of the proceedings have been made available to you here at the convention. All of us, and our colleagues who are not in the convention will be receiving information about the proceedings at this one-year old workshop in more detail through the mail.

The format of this afternoon will be presentations of a limited duration, approximately twenty minutes for each of the speakers, and somewhat less than that for me, to be followed by comments, questions and discussions for as long of this one hour forty-five minute period as we will wish to take.

The first speaker, Mr. Dimas.

MR. GEORGE C. DIMAS (Executive Director, Alcohol Studies and Rehabilitation Center, State of Oregon Mental Health Division, Portland, Oregon): Thank you. Dave, and my friends, all of you: When one speaks of beverage alcohol or one speaks of alcoholism, it means many things to many people. When one treats the excessive drinker, we as yet have not found one particular treatment process that is more effective than another.

It seems as though this one particular psychiatrist had a couple who were drinking excessively, but their underlying problem seemed to be affection. In other words, for some reason or another the husband and wife lost the desire or the need to show affection by at least hugging each other or kissing each other when they had gone to work, or vice versa. So this one particular lady felt this was quite a severe problem, so she said, "Well, dear, I have to go to the psychiatrist and tell him what the problem is. We just do not even show affection towards each other."

So she went to the psychiatrist and she said, "This is what happens. Every time he leaves in the morning, or we want to show affection, I just get a headache and I just don't get in the mood."

So the psychiatrist said, "Well, heck, this is real easy. Just tell yourself you are not going to have a headache; you are not going to have a headache."

This was really good and fine. She went home that night and she told her husband, "I have my answer from the psychiatrist. Why don't you go too, and maybe we can learn to show affection towards each other once again."

So he went to the psychiatrist and he talked to the psychiatrist, and he came home that night and he said, "I think I have my answer, dear."

The following morning they got up and just before he was ready to leave for the office, she started saying to herself, "I'm not going to have a headache; I'm not going to have a headache." He said, "Excuse me, dear." and he went to the bathroom, and he comes out and lo and behold he gave her a big hug and they showed each other affection.

Well two or three days went by, the same thing, in the morning affection time before he left and a hug and "good luck" and all this stuff. She started saying, "I'm not going to have a headache, I'm not going to have a headache." He said "Excuse me," and he went into the restroom and when he came out they hugged each other and a big kiss. Time went by and the same situation occurred. Affection time came around and she started saying, "I'm not going to have a headache, I'm not going to have a headache," and he would always say, "Excuse me, dear, I have to go into the bathroom." Well one morning the situation came about again, "I'm not going to have a headache, I'm not going to have a headache," and he went into the bathroom and this day she followed behind him and looked through the keyhole and there her husband was saying, "She's not my wife; she's not my wife; she's not my wife." (Laughter)

The point I am trying to make is that certainly we would not use this as a counseling technique, but in the field of alcoholism we try to treat the individual, and basically we say that we are dealing with people with underlying emotional problems, and beverage alcoholism possibly is an outlet.

When one talks about alcoholism and the college student it raises many interesting issues. Some of these are:

One, when should alcohol usage to excess become a disciplinary problem, and when should it become a health service problem? Can we divide it?

Another issue that arises is: Do students go to college health centers now with drinking problems? In other words, do students come to college health centers with problems? If not, why don't they?

The question I know that is entering your mind is, is there a problem there? I think we are certainly going to have to find some reliable statistics, but I seem to think there are excessive drinking

problems in the college area, probably on the border-line of addictive alcoholism or at least incipient alcoholism.

Another question that arises: How many colleges have rules against drinking, and how realistic are they?

How many of you have a rule against possession of liquor on college property, and at the same time they have faculty clubs that serve it?

Should colleges allow drinking at off-campus parties?

Recently the University of Utah released an article here that after all these years they finally decided to consider the problem of allowing drinking on off-campus parties. I was there a week ago and I asked students what they thought about this, and they said, "This is real fine. We've been doing it for years anyway."

But the difficulty in this is that they go on further to say that only those who are 21 years of age can drink at off-campus parties, but those under 21 years of age cannot. Can you see the problem here? We have three standards. One, we have parental controls. Two, we have university controls. Three, in the state they have legal controls which say legally one cannot drink until he is 21 years of age.

Another issue that arises is this: What happens to faculty members and other employees who have excessive drinking problems?

Another issue that is raised is this: Do we really know enough about drinking habits of college students?

Another that probably will be discussed today is this: Can effective objective alcohol education be integrated into the already existing college classes and what effect will it have on preventing problems related to alcohol?

Another issue that it raises is this: How can schools advocate abstinence and at the same time develop scientific objective programs about alcohol? Abstinence, and at the same time discuss this in a scientific way?

What responsibility has the college in training professionals to attack the alcohol problem at a community level?



Can colleges agree on some general guidelines related to alcohol usage and consumption on the campus?

Another one: Should graduate students be allowed to drink alcohol, as one university is doing? Now graduate students can drink alcohol, but not undergraduates. So the question immediately arises, what makes it more legal, or physiologically or emotionally sound for a 21 year old to drink, or 22, or 23, or 24, that is not logical at 18, 19 or 20? This is the question that the college student might ask you.

I think I could go on indefinitely. I think all these problems are very important, and I think that each one of you at your university is facing them. Whether the problem is small, or whether the problem is large on the campus, I do not think is the important factor. The important factor is that maybe in the near future the colleges might be willing to take a new look at this old problem.

In my remaining few minutes here, I have been asked to discuss the comprehensive approach to an alcohol problem as it relates to an entire community, and what implications does this have to you in the college community?

I would like to begin by using the first slide, if we can have it.

(Slide) Let us look at the college community as it relates to the entire community. This might be difficult to follow, so could we pass those charts out. I came prepared in case we could not see these. Just pass those out and we will try to look at the charts. Leave that on, and we will use the charts.

In developing a comprehensive program for the prevention and the control of drinking problems, for a total community approach, we are suggesting the following:

First, we have to agree upon some type of objective. At the top of your chart you will see Oregon's comprehensive program for alcoholism and drinking problems. The column to the right is prevention and control. The little box on the right.

The thing we want to emphasize is that when we are dealing with prevention, we generally consider two types of prevention, primary and secondary. The primary prevention is actually trying to not allow a problem to exist, to have its inception. Secondary is gaining control of it in its early inception.

Of course, we are realists in this field of alcoholism and know that we have to develop control programs. Once one decides on his objectives, the next category box you look at are the activities and services that should be developed to deal, again, with alcohol problems and alcoholism.

You will notice on that chart -- and they may not coincide but they are quite similar -- that we think to make the comprehensive attack on this problem that we should have these activities and services as mentioned in the box. First of all, there always should be comprehensive planning. I will not elaborate on these because of time, but I want to give you an overview of the comprehensiveness that is necessary if we are going to deal with the entire problem. We can fragment and say we can do this little thing here, and this little thing over here, and never attack the problem. It must be a comprehensive approach.

When we get to the college level it must be a comprehensive approach. I hope I can show you this: General diagnostic and evaluation services; acute in-patient services; out patient services; day and night care services.

If you have any questions on these, I would be happy to answer them in our discussion time.

Around the clock emergency services, education and information, rehabilitation services, training and manpower utilization, setting standards, leadership, recruitment, coordination, liaison, consultation, legislation and research.

In other words, what we are saying is that as you plan at your university level for your comprehensive program, we must also develop a comprehensive plan as it relates to alcoholism.

Once we have agreed upon the activities and services, the next thing one must do is ask himself: Who has the general responsibility? You notice on the chart, we take the typical health approach related to public and private agencies, and it is broken into three areas of responsibility. If we mean government, let us say government, rather than public.

So the first area of responsibility is government. The second is, there must be voluntary involvement. Third, we have added a group referred to as private, which is business and industry. These are non-profit corporations, and these are profit organizations.

Once we have decided on the general responsibility, then one must come down into its own community and ask itself, what are the potential resources in that community to deal with alcohol problems effectively? So what we have attempted to do is divide them into three categories:

1. Treatment, rehabilitation and care.
2. Education information and consultation.
3. Others.

So what we are attempting to do then is mobilize the entire community in attacking the drinking problem. What I am suggesting to you in your universities and your colleges is this: Rather than saying, well let the health department do it, or let the education department do it, I think for the most effective results we are going to have to utilize all the existing services and departments within the local community and college, if you are going to make an effective approach to this problem. You cannot have one without the other.

With this type of a basic approach then, let us ask ourselves what the role of the college community in dealing with alcohol problems could be. I think basically there are four areas you should consider.

First of all, you have to consider general education. This general education must be education that is objective. It is not education that is preoccupied with the abstinence-moderation issue. If it would become preoccupied with the abstinence-moderation issue it really closes the door to free discussion of this controversial area.

The purpose of alcohol education is nothing more than to allow ideas to clash. In the final analysis, people make decisions. Now what is the process and the goal of alcohol education? This might be a little different than what you are accustomed to, but let us take a look at it. It is something for you to think about; something for you maybe to throw a few questions at me about.

As I see it, I think that at the present time in our universities and colleges, and in society in general, we have a population here that is ill informed, or misinformed, or not informed about alcohol. In this population we have users, and in this population we have abstainers, and in this population we have another group of excessive users or problem drinkers, or you may know them as alcoholics. I like to use the term problem drinkers. They have a drinking problem.

What should we attempt to do to make education functional rather than just relating or giving facts? What must one attempt to do to make it functional?

To make anything functional, it seems to me, we must show some relationship of the problem of beverage alcohol to everyday functioning. So the approach might be this: First, if we accept the concept that there is misinformation, or no information we will probably have to say that minus knowledge results in what I refer to as minus attitudes or confused attitudes, which results in minus behavior patterns. In other words, behavior patterns with conflict. It seems that we can generally accept that if people have behavior patterns with severe conflict they may go to some other type of activity that is not normally accepted to satisfy this need.

So what I am suggesting is that we have to find a means to change this minus behavior pattern to one that is positive behavior. May I emphasize to you the issue is not whether a person drinks, or whether a person abstains. The issue is that he feels comfortable in abstaining, or he feels comfortable in drinking; or even, thirdly, that he feels comfortable, that if he has the illness of alcoholism or problem drinker in college that he will come into the health services for assistance, or if he has alcoholism later on in life that he will seek help rather than evading the problem because of the moral or other implications that are involved.

Now, how do we achieve this? It seems to me that first of all we have to devise and find some learning activities that will change minus behavior to plus behavior. I think to do this we have to do something more than just showing what alcohol does to the human being. We also must show what alcohol does for the human being -- to the human being and for the human being.

What I am suggesting now is that we must show some relationship of beverage alcohol -- that is all types of beverage alcohol, hard liquor, beers, and down the line -- some relationship of beverage alcohol to emotional, physical, the social and economic functioning. In other words, the relationship of alcohol to deal with emotions; the effect of alcohol in its relationship dealing with physical illness or problems; the relationship of alcohol to social problems and economic problems.

As you know -- if you do not know this, basically, this is the definition of the World Health

Organization that says, problem drinking or alcoholism is when a person uses alcohol to excess and it starts affecting him emotionally, physically, sociologically or economically.

So the thesis then is if we can show some relationship between alcohol and these four areas through some learning activities, always using the typical factors that influence learning, I seem to think that we can change this minus knowledge to a plus knowledge, and I think we can change this minus attitude to a positive attitude; I think we can change our behavior pattern from a minus behavior pattern to a plus behavior pattern. By a plus behavior pattern, I mean a decision that a person has made without conflict.

Again, whether he drinks or abstains is not what I am emphasizing. I am emphasizing that he feels comfortable in his decision of abstaining or in his decision to drink. I think this is the fact that I am trying to emphasize.

The second responsibility in the role of the college, as I see it, is stimulating research as it relates to alcohol. In other words, I think that we have to have more knowledge about attitudes in our society about drinking. Certainly, we have to take a closer look at the relationship of alcohol and its uses on college campuses. What I am trying to say is we should get rid of some of these sacred cows and we should start challenging some of this knowledge that has not been challenged since prohibition times. We should not allow the prohibition influence to make us a passive type of individual, afraid to attack these particular problems.

Thirdly, I think that the university and college has a responsibility that it has neglected, and that is the training of professional people to more effectively assist the communities in dealing with these problems. I do not mean teachers, per se. Certainly teachers who are going into our communities should be very effective and efficient in teaching about alcohol, but it goes beyond that. We must train our physicians, we must train our social workers, we must train our nurses, we must train all the way down the line if we are going to take a comprehensive approach to this problem.

May I say I do not think this means creating new individual courses within your curriculum. The potentiality is there in the already existing courses. Can you see the great potential that we have? I seem to feel that if we could prepare our college teachers,

our college administration, and down the line, and they would feel more comfortable in teaching about this, I think we could make great strides in this area. I do not think we have to create some type of a new mechanism or weapon to do this at the college level.

The fourth and the last role that I think the college can play -- now the first was general education, the second was research, the third was training professionals -- I think that the colleges and the universities are going to have to take a more active role in setting up some rules and regulations to assist youngsters or youth, let us call them, or college students with drinking problems, and also policies and procedures that will also assist their professional staffs.

A lot of you are saying, well, we do not have these problems. Well, in Oregon we have gone to a step lower than college. What we have attempted to do is this: Through our public school program we have attempted to find: Are there youth problem drinkers?

What we do is to carry on two or three week units of instruction. The problem that we ran across was this, once these units of instruction were finished we found many students would come up afterwards and ask the question, "Well, my gosh, this is an illness. Maybe I am drinking excessively. What can I do about it?"

You know what we found? The counselors, the teachers were not prepared to answer them, or there were not any resources available. This resulted in a federal grant, a meeting of counselors for three days. Now it has resulted in an experimental program that is in its 18th month, where we are actually setting up treatment programs, mind you, for problem drinkers for youngsters who have drinking problems within our particular schools.

Let me define this. We have two types. One is the youngster who comes from a drinking family; secondly is the youngster who is drinking excessively himself.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I will tell you again, the results thus far are rather interesting. If we have some problem drinkers -- I am not calling them alcohol addicts -- but problem drinkers in high schools, I would venture to say that the proportion of the percentage is much higher in our colleges.

I think we do have a responsibility to look in this area.

At the present time it seems that the colleges have an unwritten policy regarding both students and faculty with drinking problems. This unwritten policy could be stated in the following terms: Our colleges will pay an economic premium to its employees and students for the successful concealment of their drinking problem. When this problem can no longer be concealed the employee will be terminated -- that is the faculty member or someone else -- or the students will be dismissed. In other words, we pay an economic premium for him to conceal this.

It seems as though the doors must be opened at the college level for persons to seek help through their health service programs.

In summary, am I saying that colleges should re-examine their administrative practices regarding alcohol? Yes, I think I am saying this.

Secondly, am I saying that administrative practices and controls on the campuses are not the answers to the problem? I should say not the sole answers to the problem. Yes, I think that I am also saying this.

Thirdly, am I saying that there is a weakness in preparing students who become our community professionals so that they can develop effective programs to deal with alcohol problems? Yes, I think that I am also saying this.

Am I saying that there is a need to do more extensive research as to the cause and effect of alcohol as it relates to economic, social and emotional functions? Yes, I think I am saying this.

Am I saying that faculty, administrators and students have a responsibility to meet together now and to form regulations that are realistic regarding alcohol usage? Yes, I think I am suggesting this.

Am I saying, because of the double standards in our society and different sets of pressures in our colleges and communities, that the task becomes an even more difficult one? Yes, we are also saying this. We realize the task is difficult.

Am I saying that there are students and faculty members on campuses with drinking problems? There is no question in my mind. The big problem is identifying them or finding ways to identify these particular problems, especially the high risk student. As far as the faculty member goes, we know they are there. I think we ought to open up the avenues, rather

than saying, "If we catch you with a drinking problem we will dismiss you." The policy should be, "If you do have a health problem, like any other health problem, let us see if we can help."

May I say, we are fortunate in the Portland area where we do have quite a few faculty members of universities and high schools that we are treating now, rather successfully -- at this point I would say successfully.

Am I saying that the colleges should re-examine their policies -- that is rather redundant, but I would like to repeat it -- am I saying that the colleges should re-examine their policies at the present time concerning rules about alcohol? Look at the implications of these rules and ask yourselves whether or not they are relevant to present day goals? Yes, I think I am saying this.

Lastly, I think what actually I am saying is that the college community has to join the entire community in taking a new look at an old problem. The problem is there. The problem exists. I think that the only way we can tackle it is by actually confronting ourselves with it -- not by the personnel administrators alone, by the health officer alone, or the educator alone, but I think it encompasses all the representation of the community campus sitting down together and developing the type of program that will allow us to deal more effectively with the problem on the college campus.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: For those who came in late, our first speaker was Mr. George Dimas, Director, State of Oregon Mental Health Division, Alcohol Studies and Rehabilitation.

As noted earlier, there will be an opportunity to offer questions to Mr. Dimas later on.

Our next speaker, Dr. Bruyn, in addition to the introduction I gave him, I did neglect the fact that he is the immediate past president of the American College Health Association. Dr. Bruyn.

DR. HENRY B. BRUYN (President, American College Health Association; Director of the Student Health Center, University of California, Berkeley): I would like to speak to this challenge of education in regard to alcohol, taking off from this very excellent foundation presented by Mr. Dimas, and tackle the issue as it impresses me from the point of view of a college admin-



istrator, a physician who is and has been for some years devoting my attention and my efforts to the young adult, and to all of you, like myself, in administering a college program.

The interaction between alcohol and man has been subjected to monumental discussion and study throughout recorded history, and with scientific intensity during the last fifty years. This interaction between alcohol and the young adult in the last phases of growth development and formal education, has been the subject of attention only during the last, perhaps, fifteen years.

This interaction in the young adult years represents -- it is my conviction that this represents an opportunity to prevent problems with alcohol in later adult years, which is not only the last opportunity that we are going to have to prevent it, but it is also singularly the best possible moment in the developmental calendar, and in the cultural experience of the growing human to accomplish a sociological and psychologically significant preventive effort. As we say in medicine, a prophylactic effect.

My background in the study, research and teaching infectious diseases, leads me to a helpful analogy for me, or a comfortable analogy for me, and that is the one of the host and the parasite. If you would allow me this analogy briefly, I think it might give us some ideas on how we proceed in the effort of education. In this case, the host would be the young adult in our society, and in our particular instance, the young adult on a college or university campus; and the parasite, if we can swing the analogy into orbit, is alcohol. Now the interaction between this host and parasite is what we are trying to modify or change or affect.

The best possible interaction between the host and the parasite would be one in which there is contact, there is blending, and there is no disease. In the worst possible result of interaction there would be some bad result. The host could not handle the parasite.

In the field of infectious diseases when we want to prevent disease we learn as much as we can about the host, which gets into the field of immunology, and we learn as much as we can about the parasite, which gets into the field of bacteriology and virology, and then we apply these two areas of knowledge and we get at prevention.

I would submit that in the field of preventing, or in the problem of preventing problems with

alcohol in the later adult years, this analogy is a useful one because in this instance we know a great deal about the parasite. We know a great deal about alcohol and its affects, and its potential. It has been around for thousands of years.

We also know a great deal about the host that we are talking about, that is, the young adult on the college campus. I could belabor this point about what we know about the young adult at some length, but I do not think I have to belabor it to an audience such as yours is. You are familiar, I hope, with the developmental level, and the personality level, and the kind of host we are talking about when we talk about the young adult on the college campus.

With that familiarity, and with your knowledge about that young adult, that host in our analogy, I would ask you to join me in reviewing a little bit what we are doing in regard to education. What are we doing now, and what could we do better?

Education, in its broadest sense, is a big topic and a big word. I would like to just temporarily talk about indirect education and direct educational techniques.

The indirect educational techniques, I think, are the challenge of this NASPA Conference topic, in which we are talking about the role of the administrator, and the personnel administrator in the educational process, because I would submit that he is a source of what I am calling the indirect type of education. I think that the direct source of education is touched upon by Mr. Dimas in the sense of the more formal curriculum type of thing, the approach to alcohol education as an academic exercise.

Now I would like to give some examples of the interaction and the reaction between alcohol and college youth, and as I run through them, I would like you to think about our host and what you know about him or her, and what kind of affect do you think some of these examples would have on this young adult.

We heard a great deal this morning by way of clewing you to what I am trying to ask you to do -- we heard a great deal this morning in the very excellent review by Dr. Lunsford of the experience on our Berkeley campus. I think we heard a few messages from him about the young adult, his attitude, and his sensitivities. I think we heard and we certainly can read and experience this -- we heard what I would call the allergy of the young adult to hypocrisy and bigotry.

This is an allergy that I would speak to from experience as a pediatrician. This allergy begins in the first moments of life.

So to a few examples.

The awe-inspiring variations in laws around the country. Civil law in regard to alcohol and youth is something I am not going to get into, but I would like to mention three relatively common laws or policies that impinge upon our college youth.

There are many colleges and universities in this country which are surrounded by a legally established dry moat, one mile in width. This law is based on the assumption that this is going to dry up the campus. It is also based on the assumption that our young people will not walk this mile, or cannot, do not have the time or the energy to span the distance to get themselves in contact with the demon rum. This one mile limit is common throughout the United States.

A second legal policy that seems to have great popularity around the United States is the law which prohibits the sale or serving of alcoholic beverages to any individual under 21 years of age. This is common in many states. It impinges upon college youth because they fall into the age group between 18, 22, 24, and it is not surprising then that a variety of techniques have been used to circumvent these laws. The false identification card is a phenomenon that I have observed and kept track of in the last five or six years going around the country, and in other colleges, and I would say that the lowest price I have run into for a false I.D. card is \$1.00, and I have run into some areas where printers were perhaps a little scarce where the price goes as high as \$3.00.

It is also apparent that in the neighborhood of many campuses around this country there have developed speakeasies which are called exactly that. And they serve students without question, and apparently without fear of local law. And they have the additional advantage to the student population of being a status symbol.

The laws which forbid the serving of alcohol to individuals under 21, I must add, apply to the family circle, and in the family circle a parent who serves -- for example, in California if I were to serve, and I do, my 20-year old daughter, or offer her a cocktail before dinner, along with her family, I am breaking the law. This is true in many states.

In addition to these civil laws, and the complexities of them, colleges and universities have a variety of regulations and these are, in many instances, openly ignored by both the university and student body. There is, for example, a number of institutions that have a regulation stating that the imbibing of alcohol by an enrolled student is against college policy and subjects that individual to immediate dismissal.

This implies the ability of the college or university to know exactly what that individual is doing at all times, and in all places. It implies that in the bosom of his family, if his father or mother has the temerity to serve him or let him sip, perhaps, a brief whiff of alcohol, he is dismissed.

In one college this regulation was attempted to be changed. The faculty, students and campus administration vigorously endorsed a change in such a regulation, and then at the Board of Trustees level it was killed -- that is, changes were killed, on the basis of pressure from a temperance organization.

The introduction of beer or wine into student dining halls or recreational areas has been accomplished on a number of campuses, and it has always been vigorously fought, I might add.

In California, lately, the faculty club on a large university campus in the East Bay area, best unnamed, was allowed a beer and wine permit within the last twelve months, and I might add that after this thing was announced with great glee in the faculty newspaper, I went charging down to my faculty club and said, "Where's the beer?" And I found that it was under the counter in the front office, and that is where it has been ever since. We have the license though, and we can serve it if you know the right guy and he can sneak it out from under the counter. This is in the faculty club.

When we were given this permit for beer in the faculty club, the stipulation was made by the legislature that "a permit in a student residence hall, student dining hall, or student union would, [underline] never be allowed."

This is the implication that a student could never possibly enter the faculty club and perhaps have a drink with a faculty member, if he was a graduate student, let's say, and over 21. This was not discussed. I hope it is not going to be discussed, because I am sure that if it were the answer would be that students would not be allowed in the faculty club, which would be another question.

Another phenomenon apparently on most college campuses was beautifully illustrated by Elliott Nugent's great dramatic masterpiece, "The Male Animal." This is a play that I can truly say, when I first saw it, I rolled in the aisle. It was in a Boston theater and had a very steep balcony aisle, and I ended up down the bottom of the stairs. I do not know whether you have all seen this or not, but you certainly should, either in the movie or the play form. It is a very, very beautiful commentary on the American college scene and the myth of the college campus.

In this play the ritual of the returning alumnus was very sensitively and I use the term loosely acted out by Jack Carson. This illustrated this strange phenomenon in which the classical male alumnus considers the return to the haunts of his youth as an excuse, and indeed a direction for a wild, boisterous bacchanal, in which he expects college youth to join him and emulate him.

This demonstration of alcohol consumption by alumni and adults in the community, I think, is a problem for all of us as administrators.

One other thought on this that came about, again in personal experience. The municipal law in the area of Berkeley that prohibited the sale of alcohol within one mile of the campus was up for amendment, and I might add was subsequently amended. The WCTU took vociferous exception to this amendment and came out in the newspapers and wrote letters to editors, and so on. The president of this organization was an old friend of mine with whom I have jostled on many occasions, and at least we still maintain our love for each other despite our very fundamental disagreement on this topic.

An intelligent, eager, young student, at my suggestion, was allowed to interview this president of the WCTU and asked for her views. He wanted, as we heard this morning in this discussion, this young man wanted to find out what is going on. He wanted to talk to the source of his concern, this objection.

He was told, and I quote, and I was there, "You youngsters should mind your own business and stay out of adult affairs. When I was in college I stuck to my books, and I did not try to meddle in adult business."

Now this interview and this quote was published in the college daily and I ask again -- thinking about our young host and our parasite -- is that a good thing? Is that going to accomplish alcohol education?

Now I would like to mention several areas of concern that came out of our conference, which Dr. Robinson referred to, on alcohol and college youth. I think that we had a great deal at this conference. We had the opportunity to hear five real authority people and then thirty of us from all over the United States, thirty of us representing administration, counseling, faculty, psychology, psychiatry and medicine on the college campus, discussed and got at the things that these experts stimulated in our minds.

Several of the group conclusions I would like to mention to you, because I think they represent some of the thoughts on alcohol education. These are in the group conclusions, and they are mentioned in this monograph which is, as you probably know, on display here. For some of you who may have read it, it might be redundant, but I think it is worth emphasis.

Here are the conclusions of one group. This is the group of which Dave Robinson was a member. The most outstanding consensus of our group, the group leader reports, is that education administrators, faculty in general have responsibility in their position in our society to help form public opinion, to help form public attitudes, and to help form regulations on their campus and to help form state laws regarding the use of alcohol in our society in general.

Another thing they came up with was educators have a responsibility to teach students about alcohol and its use; that it is not the responsibility of the administrator or the faculty to teach youth how to drink, but to help the student appreciate the place of alcohol for the individual in the micro culture of the college and the macro culture of the larger society. They also said it was agreed the most effective alcohol education is conducted on the campus by and with student peer groups.

A further proposal from this conference and from this discussion group -- it came out in all four or all five of the discussion groups -- is that we needed to develop regional working conferences on the subject of alcohol on the campus for student personnel and other appropriate disciplines, and officers of the campus including students. And they desire to set up this kind of thing with students. I think you will hear a great deal more from Dr. Robinson about this.

Some of the other group conclusions that might have differed a little bit from this included an emphasis on the need for research on the college campus, research as to who is, as Mr. Dimas said, and was a problem drinker? What is his future? What can we

do about him? One of the results of this was the setting up of a committee on this topic sponsored by the American College Health Association, in which we are going to work with the National Council on Alcohol, and also the NIMH, Division of Alcohol and Drugs.

One of the discussion groups asked the question, or suggested that all colleges and universities should review their policies at the present time concerning rules about alcohol and look at the implications of these rules, and ask themselves whether they are relevant to the goal of meaningful education. I think you heard that also from Mr. Dimas.

I think that I will close at this point and hopefully we will have some time for a little discussion of this from you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: The format for this afternoon is to have Mr. Dimas present a background, a broad presentation of alcohol presentation, a part of which we as student personnel administrators should have. Next, a presentation of a very meaningful approach to alcohol education, brought to a climax at this Lake Tahoe conference last year.

I got the bug -- carrying on the analogy, Dr. Bruyn -- at the conference; through the fall and winter months developed a program which had the endorsement of the executive committee of NASPA. Five months ago this was presented to two federal agencies, this being a workshop proposal. One of the agencies has since declined a desire to support, on the basis of the cost of the proposal. The other has not yet accepted or rejected my suggestion.

The design of the proposal, which presumably will get financial support and of which you will hear more, is simply this: NASPA will sponsor -- or will if it gets the money, and by money I am talking about \$110,600.00. This is why one of the two agencies could not support it -- seven regional workshops, one each in the NASPA regions, to which 100 people would be invited, or a total of 700 people. These 700, or 100 in each region, will be mainly students selected by the student personnel staff. Fewer than 60 of the 100 will be student leaders. No more than 25 of the 100 will be student personnel administrators, male, female, deans, directors of counseling. The remaining number will be representatives from the state alcohol programs, anthropologists, faculty members who chair conduct committees, who have various functions in their respective schools.

The design of the workshop proposal will be

two-pronged. There will be three questionnaires or instruments, one to be distributed at the first of this three day workshop, inviting the participants to explain, in their own words as they understand it, what the folkways and mores of alcohol on their campuses truly are.

A second questionnaire at the close of the workshop asking them to evaluate in a rather specific way, and also inviting their comments as to what they want to do about it -- it, again, being the subject of the workshop.

And a six month instrument follow-up, as to what they have done.

I think I am with the majority of the educators in the country, and perhaps the majority of all other people, who have been thinking about the field of education in acknowledging that there is much more peer group education than ser education going on.

The whole design of this workshop proposal is to capitalize on the subject of peer group education. Specifically, during this three day period we will have the videotapes of Dr. Bruyn's Lake Tahoe workshop presented, followed by discussion, led by qualified people as sub-alcohol educators, and then discussion groups with the participants.

The theory is, of course, we will do this regionally for there are some preliminary studies now that do identify that college drinking has a regional pattern. It is not a national pattern. The folks in the Northeast drink a little differently than those in the South and those in the other parts of the country.

For once we would have some data -- granted we would identify the sources, but we would have some data to identify what the drinking patterns are.

Secondly, we would have an opportunity to educate some pretty highly selected student leaders throughout the country, with data, with materials, the videotapes which were done by the country's leaders, and Dr. Georgio Lolli being from Italy, I guess we could expand that to say international leaders on the subject of alcohol education.

If there are further questions about this, I would be glad to answer them. I would rather not go into more detail about this study, but to note that if this other agency feels that the \$110,600 that we have



asked for is indeed too much -- parenthetically, nobody has ever done a study like this before to such a degree, and consequently nobody has ever asked for that much money -- if it is denied, we will retrench and develop a pattern of alcohol education in colleges which will be similar to that which our colleagues in the drug use and abuse group of NASPA are doing, and indeed have done, as you heard this morning. The drug proposal has virtually been accepted for sponsorship.

I cordially solicit your comments, perhaps later, and indeed, if you can, in writing. The program notes (and for the next three days is correct) that I am at Emory, but at the close of this month I will be moving to the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee campus. If any one of you has an interest in this subject of alcohol education to the degree that you would like to advise those of us who are developing the program we hope is accepted, if not the program which we will then amend, I cordially invite your comments and your desires to participate in these endeavors.

We now have as much as 45, 48 minutes to use as you like to take up questions directed to either of these two people, or indeed if I could participate in answering a question I would be glad to do so.

Hold on. Dr. Bruyn wants to lead the way here.

DR. BRUYN: Dave knows how to shut me up. You have just got to jump up and down and scream. But this conference that he proposes is such a wonderful thing that I feel constrained to comment on it, because it is the sort of thing I think will accomplish-- that is the spin-off from something like he proposes, in my mind's eye, is immense as far as getting at one of our national problems of great significance.

I attended a conference at the request of the Secretary of HEW this last spring in Washington. This conference cost the government about the same as the amount proposed by Dr. Robinson, and I would contrast the conference with you.

There were some forty of us brought to Washington to confer. We did not know exactly why we were called. We had the invitation, and so we went. When we arrived we all found that we knew one another very well. We had all been on programs together before. We all got up and said to each other exactly what we had said many times before about alcohol education.

After the three days were over we congratulated each other on the same old stuff, and we went back to our institutions.

I would submit that that was one of the biggest contrasts to what Dr. Robinson is talking about, as far as expenditure of money is concerned. I would hope that this thing could come off, and I would hope that we could gain whatever support anyone of you could give us to get this thing done, because it is the sort of thing that is going to get out to the country on a large scale, and to the young adult on a large scale.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Questions, please.

... Discussion period followed ...

---

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION  
CONFERENCE DINNER

Tuesday - June 28, 1966

The Conference Dinner, held in the University of Washington Student Center, convened at seven-fifteen o'clock, Dean Donald K. Anderson, Dean of Students, University of Washington; Host Dean 1966 NASPA Conference, presiding.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I would like to call on Father Robert Rebhahn, Co-Host for the NASPA Conference, for the invocation. Father Bob.

REV. ROBERT REBHAHN, S.J. (Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Seattle University; Host Dean 1966 NASPA Conference): On behalf of us all gathered together here this evening on this friendly and spacious campus, O Lord, we humbly thank Thee for a number of things.

First of all for letting the sun shine through today, for the renewal of old acquaintances and the making of new ones, for the ideas shared in this wonderful Conference, that it will make better men and women of all of us.

And for those who have to return to their homes, may You give them a speedy return. Amen.

... Dinner was served ...

... A birthday cake was delivered to Dean Root's table and they sang "Happy Birthday" ...

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: In case you cannot see up here, the cake is being delivered to Reginald Root on the occasion of his birthday. (Applause)

I understand that we have another birthday boy in our midst, and I think you will all want to extend your greetings and congratulations to Dave Robinson. (Applause)

This is the Sixth and last general session of the 48th Annual Conference of NASPA, and it may well be the last closing dinner of NASPA conventions, for I discover in looking back through the files of NASPA that on three out of the four occasions when I have had the honor of presiding at these sessions, that immediately thereafter that session has been abolished. (Laughter)

I want first of all to welcome all of you to the campus of the University of Washington, which those

of us from here believe is one of the two most beautiful campuses in America. You have seen something of its size and its beauty on your trip out from the hotel. We only wish that more of the Conference might have been held out here, and we hope that those of you who are staying over will find the opportunity to visit with us some more before you go home.

We want to welcome you also to the great Northwest, which really now is the central part of the United States, geographically. As I told some of you at Colorado Springs several years ago, you are almost at the exact center of the United States, which, with the addition of Alaska and Hawaii, is about 200 miles west of Seattle, in the Pacific Ocean, out by Cape Flattery. Those of us in Seattle, I guess should describe ourselves as residents of the eastern part of the United States. (Laughter)

We hope that Seattle weather has been to your liking. I understand some of you think it has been a bit cool. You may recall Sam Clemens' remark that I was reminded of this morning. It was something to the effect that the coldest winter he ever spent was a summer he spent on Puget Sound. (Laughter) Actually you have been seeing some fairly typical Seattle weather, possibly a little bit cooler than normal. The rain yesterday was by special order for your benefit. (Laughter) We didn't want to let you down. (Laughter)

Actually our June has been a pretty dry one. I think up until yesterday's showers we had had something in the neighborhood of a third of an inch of rain so far this month.

The job of a Master of Ceremonies, I am told, is not to bore you with long speeches, but to introduce others who will do so. (Laughter)

Before I do this, however, tradition is that I should introduce those at the head table who will not participate actively in the program this evening, particularly those at the head table, which was referred to by Father Fitterer the other night as "the House of Lords." Tonight we have made it the House of Lords and Ladies, and I think you will agree that it is a handsomer group than you saw at the Olympic the other evening.

NASPA has such long head tables that I am not sure that I am going to be able to recognize the people at the extreme ends. I am reminded somewhat of the story that is told of the tipsy Englishman who was out on the town in London, and picked up a lady

of apparently quite easy virtue and took her to a cheap hotel. And almost immediately he came back down through the lobby, puzzling the room clerk considerably. And he explained, "Somehow twixt the fog and the grog I got an old aunt of mine." (Laughter and applause)

Somehow, despite Seattle's fog and NASPA's grog, I am going to try to get through these introductions without muffing it. Now I know you all want to applaud each and everyone of these people, but I am going to ask you to restrain that impulse. In order not to frustrate you completely, I am going to let you give one clap, like this, for each one as he arises, (laughter) and then when they have all been introduced you may applaud to your heart's content.

Beginning on my left, and will you please stand as I call your name, we have Dean Earle Clifford who, with Dr. Armacost, will work on the NASPA programs for 1968 and 1969. (Clap) One, please. (Laughter)

Next we have Dean Carl Knox of the University of Illinois, President-Elect of NASPA for this coming year, and I am going to let you applaud for him. (Applause)

Next is Mrs. Williamson, wife of our President for this coming year. (Clap) And as such, the real boss of NASPA, (Laughter) for this year.

I am reminded again of the famous saying that you must beware of a man who brags about being boss in his own home, because he is apt to lie about other things too. (Laughter)

Next is our very dear friend, Father Vic Yanitelli, President of St. Peters College, and immediate past president of this Association. (Clap)

Next, Mrs. Paul Woodring, wife of our speaker. (Clap) You're not well trained. (Laughter)

Next, President of NASPA for 1966 and '67, Dean Edmund Williamson. (Clap)

Now I am going to skip the next three persons and introduce your President this year, Dean Glen Nygreen. (Clap)

Next is Mrs. Anderson, who knows who is boss in our household. (Clap)

My colleague in the very pleasant task of hosting this Conference, Father Bob Rebhahn, Vice President and Dean of Students of Seattle University. (Clap)

Mrs. Nygreen. (Clap) They are getting better. (Laughter)

Dr. Peter Armacost (clap) who, with Dean Clifford, will work on the programs after the Cincinnati meeting.

Mrs. Knox, wife of our new President. (Clap)

Dean Tom Emmet, Chairman of this year's excellent program. (Clap) Tom's wife is not here, and that is for the same reason that Father Bob's and Father Vic's are not here. (Laughter)

Now you may applaud. (Prolonged applause)

There are also a number of distinguished guests in the audience. I am not sure that my list is completely correct, but let me attempt to introduce some of the persons who are here as special guests, and some of those who have worked to make this Conference a success. Let us treat their applause in the same manner, shall we.

First, Father Frank Costello, Executive Vice President of Seattle University. (Clap) Father Louis Gaffney, Dean of the Graduate School at Seattle University. (Clap) Dr. Marion Marts, Vice Provost of the University of Washington. (Clap) Father Edmund McNulty at Seattle University. (Clap) Is Father Morton here? No. Dean Agnes Reilly, Dean of Women at Seattle University. (Clap) Now I believe that Dean Strawn is ill. Am I correct? She is not here. Dean Strawn is the Dean of Women at the University of Washington. Her assistant, Miss Peggy Craig, I believe is here. (Clap) Are there others in the Dean of Women's staff? Is Dean Stephens here? Here she is. (Clap)

Father -- Dean Reginald Root. (Clap) And Mrs. Root. (Clap) Dr. Thomas Hodgson, Associate Dean of Students. (Clap) And Mrs. Hodgson. (Clap) Assistant Dean Al Ulbrickson, and Mrs. Ulbrickson, Are they here? Assistant Dean Ernest Leach, and Mrs. Leach. (Clap) Dr. and Mrs. Ludwig Spolyer from the University staff. (Clap) They are separated. (Laughter)

Mr. James Flint of our staff. (Clap) Mr. and Mrs. Roger Bell from our staff. (Clap) Mrs. Virginia Drake of the University of Illinois, Conference Secretary. (Clap) Miss Judy Komer of the University of Detroit, another Conference Secretary. (Clap) Mr. Leo Isen, an honorary member of NASPA and Conference Reporter. (Clap)

Now could I ask everyone who has not been introduced to stand up (laughter) and we will all give each other a big hand. (Applause)

Excuse me. I have missed three very important people. Mr. Arthur Pringle from the University staff, and I believe he is representing ACUHO here. (Clap) And two young men who are responsible for Regie's birthday cake, the president of the Washington student body, Mr. Judd Kish (clap) and Mr. Ed. Woolen, vice president of the student body. (Clap)

I shall now call on Dean Nygreen who will present the NASPA Distinguished Service Awards.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: Chairman Don, and Friends: The task which is mine this evening, on behalf of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, comes not as a surprise since it is printed in the program of this annual meeting, and you all know the chore which has fallen to my privilege to perform this evening.

Some time ago the Executive Committee of NASPA determined that it wanted to find a means by which it could recognize outstanding contributions and distinguished service to American higher education. By the nature of the special interest which we represent, this should be in the area of student personnel work and student personnel administration.

In our early discussions of this program it became known as the "schmaltz" award. (Laughter) And as time went on and we discussed it and thought about it from various angles, we would bring it up on the agenda under that title. The Director of Schmaltz is now the President of St. Peters College. (Laughter) I know not what connection that has to do with anything.

I suppose I might pause for a moment and tell what has become one of my favorite stories. It has to do with our immediate past president who, upon being designated president of St. Peters College, quickly got out of touch with his old friends. So one day I called him and I said, "Father Vic, you and I have been doing business for sometime, and you have not yet told me what it is like to be the president."

"Well," he said, "you know, it was a member of our faculty who posted bail for Daniel Miller, a young man in New York, a member of the Catholic Workers organization, who was the first young man to burn his draft card and was arrested and fined. You know, it seems since I have been president as if I

have done nothing except answer the telephone and meet in my office with protesting delegations of parents and alumni and faculty and others, to whom I must very patiently explain that a president just does not fire a faculty member because he has done something which is both legal and Christian."

And I think this is something of a measure of the man who we have the distinction to call our immediate past president and whose mark of feeling is on this award which is ours tonight.

In 1937 the first major recognition of student personnel work in American higher education was evidenced by the appointment of a committee on student personnel of the American Council on Education. I should like to read the roll of members of that first Commission in 1937: F. F. Bradshaw, A. J. Brumbaugh, C. Gilbert Wrenn, Donfred Gardner then president of NASPA, Esther Lloyd-Jones, and George Zook. The work of this committee quickly established bench marks of achievement and status for this field. After World War II the work of this Commission was revised under the Chairmanship of E. G. Williamson our incoming NASPA President, Bill Blaesser, William S. Carlson, Dan Feder, Helen Fisk, Esther Lloyd-Jones, T. R. McConnell, Thornton Merriam, Lucile Allen, and W. H. Cowley.

When we decided that this award should be given on this occasion -- and because of the vicissitudes of the U. S. mails (I guess that must be the reason) our awards are not actually physically here this evening -- we had no dispute whatsoever as to what we should do.

We knew, first of all, that these awards should not recognize service to an organization and we should, therefore, not look just to the persons we knew best, the ones we associated with within NASPA. We quickly found ourselves in common agreement on the people we would recognize. And the name of the first person on that list was the person whose name appeared as a member of this ACE Committee on Student Personnel both in 1937 and in its post-war makeup.

I do not quite trust myself to depend on my own mind and heart to tell you about the gracious and wonderful lady whose citation I shall read. Let me confine it to the reading, because it expresses what all of us feel about her, and says what we want to have known to all who come after us in recognition. The citation reads as follows:

"In the growth and development of student personnel work as a profession and as a calling,



Esther McDonald Lloyd-Jones has played a unique and central role for over 35 years. As teacher, scholar and consultant her impact has been astonishingly broad and creative. Her students occupy important posts in counseling, guidance, and administration at all levels of education in countries around the world. Her effort to pull together the philosophical and research bases of our field from the several relevant disciplines has given new and energetic impetus to the growth of the intellectual dimensions of our field. Her writings have been meaningful to two generations of educators and will be standard reference points for years to come. She has just retired from Columbia's Teachers College, but her work and leadership continue.

"It is in the humanitarian aspects of student personnel work that Dr. Lloyd-Jones has enabled it to be termed a helping profession. Any vital sense of community is based upon people caring for each other. Dr. Lloyd-Jones has kept this understanding central to her teaching and leadership. Her students and all who have come within her sphere of influence have been strengthened in a professional expertise suffered with the emotional strength which comes from love for others based on deep and pervasive spiritual as well as intellectual sources.

"We deans and administrators of student affairs give salute and honor to one whom we owe debts of gratitude and affection: gratitude for the substance of her contributions and leadership, and affection for her warmth of personality and largeness of spirit. She has strengthened and ennobled us and our occupation. All this she has accomplished while being a successful and accomplished wife and mother.

"This award and its citation is presented at the 48th Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators meeting in Seattle, Washington, June 28, 1966."

Esther Lloyd-Jones, when the plaque -- a beautiful plaque designed under the direction of Father Yanitelli -- and the engraved citation come I hope you will keep them prominently displayed in your home, knowing that they come from your colleagues, administering student personnel programs across the country, and though you have never been a member, but frequently a guest of ours, you are nonetheless our leader and we owe you a great debt.

Esther, won't you come to the microphone.  
[The dinner guests arose and applauded at length.]

Another name that appeared on that list was that of Professor W. H. Cowley. Dr. Cowley has probably had as much intellectual influence upon student personnel work in higher education as any man in our lifetime. In 1929, Dr. Cowley was brought from the University of Chicago, where he had earned his Doctorate, to head the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University. There he not only began a program of research which has continued to this day, but he stimulated others to conduct investigations in the same area.

He was able to influence many persons and interest them in student center of research through his editorship of the Journal of Higher Education. He was familiar with the early sociological work of Graham Sumner, and he encouraged studies of what he then called "Campus Folkways or Mores" in a score of collegiate institutions. Here was an effort to use some of the early concepts of sociology in looking at student life in its own right, viewing the student, student life and the student society as a single institution. This represented a movement away from the single view of the college and university in terms of the avowed purpose and beginning to look at it in terms of how it appears to the students themselves, with their varied purposes.

Professor Cowley's work in this area, in the main, was done in the period 1929-1938, before he left Ohio State to become the president of Hamilton College from 1938 to 1944. He is now the David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, and much of the research work which is being done today stems directly from the pervasive theme with which Hal Cowley lived his life.

The citation reads as follows:

"To W. H. 'Hal' Cowley, one of the pioneer professors of Higher Education when he assumed the David Jacks chair of Higher Education at Leland Stanford University in 1945, a post he holds at present.

"Before this association, his speeches over the years have been highlights: 'The Disappearing Dean of Men,' 'History of Student Housing' and his truly outstanding 'Student Personnel Work in Retrospect and Prospect' given at our meeting at Berkeley and Stanford in 1956.

"To a pioneer in student personnel and higher education research, centered on the student, to a visionary in the application of behavioral science knowledge and techniques to the field of student

personnel work and administration, to a founder of inter-association cooperation and effort, to scholar, teacher and leader in the establishment of student personnel and higher education as academic fields and to a lifelong friend of this Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators is honored to present one of its first two Distinguished Service Awards to Professor W. H. 'Hal' Cowley.

"Done at the 48th Annual Meeting of the Association in Seattle, Washington, June 28, 1966."

Hal, the award and its engraved citation will arrive shortly. I hope you, too, will display them prominently and be reminded of the debt of leadership and gratitude which we recognize we owe to you. Dr. Cowley. [The dinner guests arose and applauded at length.]

DR. W. H. COWLEY: Dean, I had not any intention of saying anything, but the Dean has asked me to say a few words, so I speak for Esther as well as for myself.

Three of us sitting here together tonight, I think, are the oldest people in this business, and I am the oldest in years and in service. I am not boasting about this. The date of 1929 is too late. I entered this field in 1924 in industry, and Ed came in a year or two later, and Esther also.

In any case, it is good at the end of one's career, the end of a chapter in one's career at least, to be recognized by one's fellows as having been a worthy member of the guild.

Of course, I have never been a member of this Association. Someone mentioned it to me tonight that I made my first talk before it 29 years ago, in 1937, and then again I was invited back at almost a ten year period. This is the fourth appearance -- 1947, 1956 and now, 1966.

In any case, it is good to have the associations and the old faces that I knew are no longer here. Don Gardner, for example, and Dean Goodnight from the University of Wisconsin, the men I used to know at Michigan, and seeing the new faces, and having an Association that is going on vigorously, it is good to know that one has contributed something to it.

I know I am not really skillful in speaking this way, and certainly not skillful enough to speak for Esther, but she said as I came up here, "If they ask you to speak, speak for me too," and I do.

Thank you for us both. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: This evening's address in a very real sense is the cap stone and the climax of the 48th Conference of NASPA. It is very appropriate, I think, that Tom Emmet was able to search out and find a man of eminence who would bring us words of real wisdom. This I know he has done.

It has been said that the length of an introduction has a direct relationship to one's uncertainty about the speaker's ability to handle his subject. (Laughter) Were that the case, I could very properly say I present Dr. Paul Woodring, and sit down and leave it at that.

But as an audience settles back to listen to an address there is always the lurking question, "What manner of man is this?" And each person's receptiveness is in part, at least, colored by the answer. So I will attempt to give you at least a short running start.

Most of you already know Dr. Woodring as the Education Editor of the Saturday Review. And if you judge by his clear and succinct writing you will have great expectations as I do. But quite likely many of you do not know that we here in Washington claim him as one of our own, and I am sure that we can be pardoned for pointing to him with real pride. True, he is not a native son. Like I am, he is a native of Ohio, but he did start his career in higher education here in Washington, 27 years ago, as an instructor in psychology at Western Washington State College in Bellingham. He is still identified with that institution now as a Distinguished Service Professor. He is providing leadership and some exciting new developments at that institution. But this fact I think will give you a clearer insight into the kind of a man he is. I am told that this past term he insisted on teaching a beginning course in psychology for freshmen.

What has happened along the line since 1939 I will not try to recite, except in a very capsulized form. A few significant facts: During the war he served overseas as a Lieutenant-Colonel. At one time he served as interim president at Western Washington College. In addition to his writing, which has brought him fame in many places, he has managed to produce five books, three colleges and two universities have been moved to award him honorary degrees. He has done much to interpret the educational scene of the nation, as much as any man I know. That he is a wise man of real substance, with great versatility as a scholar, as a

teacher, and as an administrator needs no further documentation.

But really, what kind of a guy is he? Not knowing him personally, I inquired among some of his long time associates in Bellingham, hoping perhaps that I might pick up an interesting tidbit or two, but apparently he has led quite an exemplary life -- or no one is telling tales. (Laughter)

Merle Kuder did comment that he is an expert at something called 5-card draw. (Laughter) I want to find out about that. (Laughter)

But I do get a picture of a very human sort of a man, with a very real sensitivity to what makes people tick. I am sure that after what he has to say to us this evening, he will leave no doubt about his keen understanding of students in this day and age, nor about his insight into the problems with which all of us deal. He is, I am sure, a kindred soul with all of us. Dr. Woodring. (Applause)

DR. PAUL WOODRING (Distinguished Service Professor, Western Washington State College; Education Editor-at-Large, Saturday Review): Thank you. Dean Anderson, President Nygreen, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am tempted to open my remarks with an expression of heartfelt sympathy for the members of this audience -- not because of the speech you are about to hear -- I shall try to make that as painless as possible -- but of sympathy for the positions which you hold. Most of you are deans of students in colleges or universities. And, in this period of student unrest, yours is just about the most difficult job in college administration.

I wish I could assure you that your task will become easier in the years just ahead. But my real conviction is that it will become more difficult. It seems altogether probable that the kinds of disorder that brought national attention to the Berkeley campus eighteen months ago, and to a dozen other campuses just this past year will spread to just about every campus in the land.

In attempting to understand the underlying causes of the problems you will face it seems necessary for us to take a hard look at the generation of which the students now in college are a part. Oldtimers -- and I hardly need remind this audience that to a college student anyone over the age of thirty is an oldtimer -- oldtimers when trying to assess the faults and virtues of the younger generation are prone to take one of four basic positions.

The first and most venerable view is that the younger generation is going to the dogs -- that the young people of today are less virtuous, less reliable and responsible, less willing to work, and more lacking in integrity than those of previous generations. This view may be found in Greek and Roman literature and in the literature of just about every period since those classic times. Pundits throughout the centuries have predicted that the civilization for which the coming generation would soon be responsible would decline. And they have not always been wrong. Greek culture did fall into ruin. The Roman empire, after a period of moral dissolution, did decline and fall apart. It is possible that our own civilization is about to enter its twilight phase. Spengler thought so. Perhaps he was right but I do not believe it. Not yet. Within our culture there is much disorder but there is also a great deal of rugged vitality. In some members of the younger generation, as well as in many members of our own generation, we may observe the kinds of moral decline and degeneration that accompanied the fall of Rome but I do not yet see it in the culture as a whole.

A second view, often expressed by optimistic commencement speakers, is that this is the best of all possible generations -- that today's crop of college students is more virtuous, more enlightened, more highly motivated and better educated than any that has come before. As a result, a better world lies ahead of us and we may face the future with confidence. I cannot accept this view either -- not as a broad generalization. It is too optimistic for my tastes. It ignores too many symptoms of profound illness within the society including some segments of the younger group. I am not at all confident that this generation, when it moves into positions of responsibility, as soon it must, will be able to solve the world's problems any better than we have done.

A third view, popular with elderly college professors of the Mr. Chips variety, is that one generation is very much like another -- that every generation must go through a period of adolescent rebellion -- that each believes it to be the first to have discovered sex and liquor -- that every generation finds it difficult to accept the rules and regulations that govern the adult world in any civilized society -- but that all this is just a matter of growing up. According to this view, after graduation this generation will become very much like those that have gone before -- moderately virtuous, moderately industrious, moderately honest, and moderately stuffy. All it will take is a little time, a job, a marriage certificate, three or four children, and a house bought on the installment plan. There is a large element of truth in this, of course.

Rebels do become conservatives, not because of age but because of responsibilities and a growing vested interest in the status quo. But I cannot believe all of it. I think this oncoming generation is indeed different from any that has lived in the past.

A fourth position, and the one that to me seems most consistent with the evidence, is that each generation is a product of its own time and that each develops its special character in response to the peculiar pressures, challenges, and opportunities of the world in which it matures. And, in this respect, today's young people are substantially different from any that have come before because they have grown up in a different world.

This generation has lived all its life in the shadow of the bomb. Those bright enough to go to college are aware that there is at least a possibility that the human race may have no future. Previous generations have also faced terror -- the Black Death, the hordes of Genghis Kahn, the threat of war by artillery, bombs, and poison gas. But this generation is the first to face the possibility of total annihilation of the human race.

But while this threat lies in the background, this generation has grown up in a world of unparalleled affluence. Most of today's college students, unlike their parents who survived the depression and World War II, have had no direct personal experience with poverty, unemployment, hunger, war, or hard work as our ancestors knew hard work. War is something they hear about and fear but not something that they know or have seen. Unemployment -- the inability of well educated people eager to work to find jobs of any kind -- is something they read about in the history books but cannot really believe. Few of them believe it can ever happen to them. Few doubt that once they get college degrees each will have his choice of a half dozen jobs from which he may choose.

Most of them have lived all their lives in a house with heating and air-conditioning, at least one bathroom, electric lights, radio, TV and a hi-fi set, all the books they have wanted to read, plus labor-saving conveniences that their grandmothers never dreamed of. They have grown up in a world of orange juice, vitamin pills, and unlimited food supplies -- the first generation in history to be bombarded with advertisements boasting of foods and drinks that contain a minimum number of calories.

They know that except for the possibility of wars and revolutions they can expect to live all their



lives in physical comfort, surrounded by too much food, too much liquor, too many gadgets. They know, or at least they believe, that they can count on full employment at good salaries and on social security and medicare for their old age. They can count on all these things simply because they are Americans living in the last third of the twentieth century who will live a part of their lives in the twenty-first century.

But they are aware. They know, or at least they have read, that half the people in the world go to bed hungry every night. They are aware that grave injustices exist within the United States. They know that war and the threats of war still beset mankind. They feel a bit guilty to be living so comfortably in a world in which so many people are hungry and downtrodden. And they are prone, quite illogically, to blame something vaguely called "the establishment" for everything that is wrong in the world.

It is possible, too, that they have encountered the hedonistic paradox -- that they have discovered that physical comforts and luxuries do not make for happiness. They have discovered that the secure life is not the good life. They have only to observe their parents to discover that physical comfort and social security do not assure happiness, contentment, or an exciting and interesting life. And so they ask, "Is this all there is?" and they look for something new, for kicks or for a cause. The kick may be LSD -- liquor is now considered old-fashioned and middle-class. The cause may be almost anything that will upset their parents or the establishment.

But before we go further we must ask just how many of today's students we are talking about. How many or what proportion are troubled, unhappy, restless, angry and to some degree alienated from the adult society? There can be no easy or certain answer. We have no accurate statistics based on an adequate sampling of the five million young men and women now in college. At best the psychological traits we have described are very difficult to measure and even the best of statistics do not reveal the truth if the raw data is unreliable.

I think we can agree that today's student body includes many students, probably the great majority, to whom the adjectives "troubled, angry, and alienated" do not apply. Polls on a number of campuses have confirmed this. At the University of Wisconsin, according to a press release last winter, only six percent expressed strong dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching and only sixteen percent opposed our war effort in Viet Nam. Eighty-six percent indicated that they trusted the university administration. Each of us knows many students



who are thoughtful, responsible, and even wise. We know others who are complacent, conventional in outlook, and too well satisfied with the world as it is to want to change things very much. We know others who are status seekers eager to climb the ladder of success. We know some who are happy to join fraternities or sororities and to follow the instructions of cheer leaders at football games. But it is not these who make the front pages, who find their pictures in LIFE and LOOK and whose motives are dissected by the many writers who have turned their attention to what is sometimes called the "Berkeley Fallout." We are talking not about the majority but about those who stand out because they are different.

In each period of history it is not the majority but a visible minority that gains public attention and is remembered. In the decade of the twenties it was not the majority of coeds who dressed like John Held's flappers and danced the Charleston till dawn while getting drunk on bathtub gin. It was only a minority of the male students of that decade who wore coonskin coats and drove Stutz Bearcats. Perhaps if it were not for John Held, Jr., and F. Scott Fitzgerald we would not remember that minority today but I think we would remember them anyway because it was this minority that gave the twenties its special flavor. It was they who overthrew the Puritan morality of an earlier generation and prepared the way for things to come. They broke far more rules than are broken by today's undergraduates because they had more rules to break. They forced changes in the rules. And they are the parents -- possibly even the grandparents -- of today's students. The special flavor of the thirties was provided by those students -- again a minority but a noisy and visible minority -- who joined picket lines, signed pledges that they would never take part in any war, no matter what the cause, and sometimes rejected their allegiance to the United States and joined the Communist party. I do not know how many of these there were but they got a lot of attention.

The difference between the visible minority of the twenties and that of the thirties is notable because each was responding to life in a special period of history. In the twenties -- a period of great prosperity and no very serious international threats -- the demand was for personal freedom -- the right to burn one's candle at both ends without interference from parents, deans of women, or Mrs. Grundy. In the thirties, a time of depression and of the rise of Hitlerism, the demand was for an immediate solution to the social, political, and economical problems that threatened the world. And, because of these differences in the problems which they faced, the students of the thirties were notably different from those of the previous decade.

Students of the sixties combine the traits of those two earlier decades and it is a weird combination. Like those of the twenties they live in a time of prosperity and reflect the hedonism made possible by affluence. But, like the students of the thirties, they are acutely aware of social injustice in the nation and throughout the world. And, again like those of the thirties, they face war and the draft and blame their elders for not knowing how to avoid war.

It is natural and desirable that young people, when they become aware of the many evils of the world, should fight for causes. George Bernard Shaw was only half joking when he said that anyone under the age of thirty who was not a revolutionary was an inferior. But there are good causes and bad ones and some that lie in between. And there are effective ways and futile ways of attacking a good cause. A man must be judged both by the cause he espouses and by the means he employs in attacking it.

In their search for a cause today's students-- the visible minority of which we are speaking -- have challenged the establishment on a curiously assorted variety of issues: sexual freedom, civil rights for themselves and for minority groups, parietal rules of the university, the quality of instruction, the draft, Viet Nam, the right to use LSD, and the right to carry signs bearing four letter words. Aided and abetted by drop-outs and non-students they have lashed out wildly against college administrators, the military establishment, boards of regents, the police, the courts, the State Department, and the President of the United States who was burned in effigy just off one campus.

Some of these protests are silly, some are misguided, and some may border on treason. But some of the causes espoused by the students are very good ones which the students share with the rest of us. Those who demand civil rights and equality of treatment for minority groups are on the side of the Constitution, the Supreme Court, the President, and the majority of the American people.

Those who demand better instruction in the university and more attention to undergraduates also have a good cause. It is true that the status symbols of the university have been rigged against good teaching -- the highest rewards have gone to those who give their time to other things. Every large university has some professors and some junior ones who are contemptuous of undergraduates and do not want to teach them. Students are right in calling attention to these facts and demanding a change.

Those who carry signs saying "Get out of Viet Nam" or who boo, threaten, or walk out on speakers from the State Department who have been invited to explain and defend our foreign policy are in a different category. They are vulnerable on two counts. They are demanding a simple solution to an enormously complex problem for which there can be no simple solution. When Chamberlain at Munich gave in to Hitler on the issue of Czechoslovakia he thought he had found a quick and simple road to peace. It did not turn out that way -- appeasement rarely does. In demanding a quick solution that requires walking out on our commitments they are pitting their own judgment against that of men of long experience who have been given the responsibility, under a democratic government, for foreign policy. It is true that the students have the support of many of their professors and of two or three Senators, though it must be said that the Senators, being older, wiser, and better informed, do not propose an immediate withdrawal of forces as some of the students do -- they use the word "gradual."

Full debate on issues of policy is a legitimate and necessary part of the democratic process. Students should take part in that debate. But debate is an intellectual activity which requires listening to the views of others while defending our own. Booing a speaker, or creating such a din that he cannot be heard, is not debate. It is not an intellectual response but is rather the response of demagogues. It has no place in an intellectual community such as a university ought to be. Students who refuse to allow a speaker to be heard are vulnerable to the charge that they are denying him the right of free speech.

In sharp contrast are those students who have chosen freedom of speech as their cause. Often they mean freedom of speech for students. On a few campuses, where freedom of speech is indeed sharply limited, it is a good cause. But on other campuses it is a silly cause because there are no significant restrictions on freedom of speech. On the Berkeley campus the students have about as much opportunity to express their views as free men have ever had anywhere. At most there were only a few restrictions on time and place, and these were not enforced for long. Mario Savio, the leader of the so-called Free Speech Movement, was allowed to express his views freely, not only on and off the campus but in radio and television interviews, in the daily press, and in a dozen national magazines. No undergraduate in the history of the world has enjoyed so much freedom of speech or so large an audience for his views.

If not free speech, what then was the issue at Berkeley?

One answer was given by William Peterson, a professor of sociology on that campus. "In fact, preposterous as it may seem," said Peterson, "the real issue was the seizure of power." And he quotes from the student publication, SLATE, this demand, "Go to the top. Make your demands to the Regents. If they refuse to give you an audience, start a program of agitation, petitioning, rallies, etc., in which the final resort will be CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE....ORGANIZE AND SPLIT THIS CAMPUS WIDE OPEN." It is my contention that the desire to destroy a university is not a good cause for students or for anybody else.

The demand for greater sexual freedom is probably the most complicated of all issues. It is true that the mores are changing and that the laws governing sex are so badly antiquated that a large proportion of adults could be sent to prison if the laws were rigidly enforced. Until recently anyone who practiced birth control in Connecticut was breaking a law. In some states a boy over eighteen who indulges in heavy petting with a girl just under that age is "contributing to the delinquency of a minor" and guilty of a felony. Students know that such laws are unenforced and unenforcible and charge hypocrisy.

But the students are mistaken in thinking that the sexual revolution is something that they started themselves only three or four years ago. Actually the sexual mores have shifted back and forth between rigid and relaxed throughout history. Many periods in history, including some of Greece and Rome, have been more relaxed than ours. Our grandfathers, who lived in the late nineteenth century, attempted to enforce a rigid code of conduct and to close the doors to sexual activities for unmarried boys and girls. But these doors, which were never successfully locked and barred, have been set ajar by the more permissive society of the twentieth century.

The sexual revolution -- more accurately called the shift toward a more relaxed standard -- began early in this century. It was accelerated by World War I. It was off with a roar in the nineteen-twenties. Long before that decade the automobile had been invented and all its uses had been discovered by undergraduates. A date in the back seat of an automobile was discovered to be something quite different from a date in the family living room with mother hovering in the background. But all this happened first, not to this generation, but to men and women now in their fifties and sixties.

What is new to this generation is not the activity of sex -- that has been known since Adam and Eve. What is new is a demand for greater frankness

and for social approval. The flappers of the twenties did not ask the dean of women or their own grandmothers to approve their conduct. They did not want such approval -- they found it more exciting to break the rules -- to enter the dormitory room through a window at daybreak.

Today's generation is different. Instead of wanting to break the rules it demands that the rules be changed. It demands the elimination of all rules regarding dormitory hours. It wants the college to authorize intervisitation in dormitories and to provide contraceptive pills. This is indeed something new.

Though at the moment all appears to be chaotic, it may be that the younger generation is evolving a new code of its own. If so, it could use some adult guidance for, as Richard Hettlinger points out in his book, The Student's Dilemma, "There is no field of human activity in which it is easy to deceive oneself and to be convinced by arguments which are in fact nothing but rationalizations of clamant desires."

Adults who wish to provide guidance should be familiar with the sources of enlightenment to which today's students turn for their information on sex. Insofar as they draw their conclusions from the printed word they are influenced by the books of Albert Ellis, the Kronhausens, the Kinsey Reports, and Hugh Hefner's Playboy Philosophy of recreational sex far more than by the antiquated views of Havelock Ellis, Kraft-Ebbing, Sigmund Freud and Bertrand Russell.

Those students who choose "freedom of the press" for their cause present a special problem to college administrators. Freedom of the press is a right guaranteed by our Constitution and essential to a democracy. But when it is applied to a college paper or other student publication some special problems arise.

Freedom of the press does not mean -- and has never meant -- that any student has a right to say anything he pleases about any individual, group, or institution, and to demand to have it published at college expense and distributed to all the students of a college who have been forced to pay for the paper -- through student fees -- as a part of the cost of admission to the college. All magazines and newspapers are selective in what they publish. Someone decides and that someone rejects many stories, articles, and editorials for every one that he accepts. This is not censorship-- it is editorial selection based upon a previously established policy. Some pieces are rejected because they are badly written, some because the facts presented are

unsound, some because the reasoning is illogical, some because they would open the publication to libel or slander suits.

Editorial policy is made by the editors, the publishers, or some combination of the two. In some cases a senior editor or departmental editor or a columnist, such as Walter Lippman who signs his name, is allowed to say anything he pleases without having his work reviewed by anyone. But such individuals are those who have earned the right by many years of successful experience and whose names carry weight with the reader. If the readers do not like what is said they are free to cancel their subscriptions at any time and some do so.

A college paper is different. Usually it is supported from student fees and has a monopoly. No student can cancel his subscription and get his money back. On most campuses no competition is allowed. Moreover the editors, like the writers, are young and green -- even the most senior editor has worked on the paper for only three or four years and often less than that. Often the editor is under twenty-one and hence, under our laws, not legally responsible -- he cannot be sued for libel or slander.

The publisher is legally responsible. But who is the publisher? The best way to find out is to let something slanderous or libelous be published in a college paper, let someone sue for damages, and see who pays. It will not be the students.

I do not know the answer to these difficult problems. But I do know that any faculty that renounces all its responsibility for student publications is not teaching students to take their proper part as junior staff members of an adult magazine or newspaper. It is leading them to expect a degree of freedom without responsibility that they will never find in the adult world. It is not preparing them to face reality.

Learning to distinguish among causes -- to tell the good and important ones from those that are either petty or trivial or questionable -- should be one of the goals of higher education. It is a goal for which neither parents nor faculties have yet taken as much responsibility as they should.

In some respects, I think the students are ahead of their parents and superior in virtue, as I judge virtue, to students of a generation ago. As one example, it seems clear that fewer students of this generation are guilty of racial and religious prejudice. More of them are willing to grant all the privileges of American life to all racial minorities and to

accept them as social equals. Only a few years ago many college fraternities and sororities restricted their membership to those of a single race and one category of religion. Even today the alumni of these fraternities -- those who graduated only a few years ago -- are prone to resist efforts of local chapters to admit anyone other than white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants. But today's students do not share such a limited view of brotherhood.

But today's students seem more prone to be guilty of prejudice of a new kind. Those who say, "We don't trust anyone over thirty" are expressing a violent prejudice against an age group -- they are prejudging people on the basis of age with no regard to individual merit. This is just as immoral and just as stupid as it would be to say that we don't trust anyone of one racial or religious group and should be equally subject to condemnation. It is not the response of a civilized, educated adult.

I detect too, on the part of a growing number of young people, a prejudice against all those who hold positions of responsibility -- administrators, the courts, and the police. On college campuses this takes the form of distrust of administrators including presidents and deans of students who have the responsibility for bringing the mores and the laws to bear on the younger generation. It is true that dislike for those who make and enforce the rule is a widespread phenomenon -- top sergeants have rarely been popular with privates. But college students, selected on the basis of high intelligence and superior academic preparation, ought to be able to discriminate between good administrators and bad, between honest and necessary law enforcement and that which is brutal or corrupt.

One of the goals of a college education should be to help students understand the need for responsible leadership in the nation, the state, and the college and the need for giving such leadership sufficient power to enable it to maintain some degree of order. If a large segment of our educated people should develop a blind prejudice against the police, the courts, and those who hold responsible positions, law enforcement would become impossible. The result would be complete anarchy. And anarchy in a world of three billion people -- or in a nation with two hundred million, would be a frightening prospect.

It is true that some laws are bad and some rules are unnecessary. These should be changed through democratic procedures in which students should play a part. But student extremists who propose the overthrow of constituted authority, and who quote Thoreau's essay



on Civil Disobedience often fail to comprehend the nature of the democratic process. I like the reply made to such students by Martin Meyerson when he was Acting Chancellor at Berkeley. Meyerson said: "I believe civil disobedience is warranted as a last resort in our democracy -- it was warranted at Boston at the famous Tea Party -- it has been warranted at other times and places. But civil disobedience is warranted only when there is no recourse to reasonable deliberation. Avenues of recourse are now available on this campus."

It is your job as deans of students to see that the avenues of recourse are kept open on all your campuses. In colleges with a small student body the task should not be impossible unless yours is one of the colleges that attracts a particularly strident student body. In the larger universities the task is far more difficult. The problem of communication in an institution with a student body of 25,000 or 30,000 students, perhaps two thousand faculty members, and hundreds of administrators who do not even know each other, is one that has not yet been solved on any large campus. The only solution I can see is that of breaking up the undergraduate student body into units of workable size -- perhaps six hundred or eight hundred students -- each with its own basic faculty. Such a unit can be a true community of scholars. As you know many institutions are moving in this direction: The University of the Pacific, the Santa Cruz Campus of the University of California, Michigan State, Florida State, and many others.

At Western Washington where I have been chairman of the Faculty Long-Range Committee for the past year we are beginning to move in that direction with plans for an experimental college to be called Fairhaven which will be the first of several units of about six hundred each. Fairhaven students will take part in a program of broadly liberal education taught by the Fairhaven faculty whom they will get to know well and will then take a major from one of the more highly specialized academic departments of Western Washington College. They will live in their own dormitories which will provide the focus for both their academic and social life throughout the four undergraduate years. Western is not yet, by university standards, a large institution. But we have concluded that our present student body -- 5200 last year and probably 6000 next fall -- is already too large to operate effectively as a single unit. We have decided to do something about it now and not wait until the problems have overwhelmed us.

I think it highly probable that within twenty years all large institutions will have found it neces-



sary to move in the direction of cluster colleges. But by that time we shall have a new generation of students. And perhaps they will differ from those of 1966 as much as these differ from those of a generation ago. The students who now are saying, "We don't trust anyone over thirty" will then be forty years old. Some of them will be professors and some will be deans of students. We who are then retired will watch with amusement as they grapple with the problems of a younger and different generation.

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That one young fellow you were talking about, Dr. Woodring, does not carry a four letter word; he is one. (Laughter) We thank you very much for those words of wisdom in this concluding session of our Conference.

Now I would like to call again upon Dean Nygreen.

PRESIDENT NYGREEN: My final privileges as President of this Association for the past year are two. The first is to express the appreciation of this audience and of the Association to a number of people.

To Professor and Mrs. Woodring and all others who have given us leadership in the stimulating program which has been ours these past two and a half days.

To the gracious lady and the honorable gentleman who have honored us as guests of this Conference and in the acceptance of awards with which we want to mark a place forever to be theirs in American higher education.

To the officers and leaders of this Association, to Dean Tom Emmet whose skill in this program has been remarked upon and appreciated by you all.

To the officers of this year's Executive Committee, and to all the membership who have in such a remarkable way responded to the stimulus provided by the efforts of our Commissions, Divisions, and Committees.

To Dean Donald K. Anderson, to Father Robert Rebhahn, our co-host deans, to the members of their staffs, and to all the people who have served us so graciously.

To you, Leo Isen, to Virginia Drake, to the people in a marvelous hotel who have attended to our

needs almost without needing to be reminded; and to the many gracious and wonderful people in this heartland of the United States, and, Don, I accept that without any reservations whatsoever. To all of you, thank you very much.

Now my final task is to remind you of the words of Hal Cowley at this microphone a few minutes ago. Hal Cowley said that he, Esther Lloyd-Jones and E. G. Williamson represented, in a way, the beginnings, the real source of leadership in the field of student personnel work.

As I turn over the reins of leadership in NASPA to E. G. Williamson, I think it marks a significant point in our history. He was a member and participant in meetings when this Association was known as NADAM. When I first made a pilgrimage to the office of a leader in our field, it was to the office of E. G. Williamson, who greeted me graciously and gave me from his busy schedule an hour and a half which I shall never forget.

I think we are all honored by his decision to serve us, and we him. I think this Association has come of age and I think, Ed, we shall be worthy of each other. So to you I turn over this gavel and the reins of leadership for what I hope will make the 49th year of this history its best ever.

Ed. Williamson, will you come and take over the reins of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators -- sub-title, for those of you who are new, the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs.

... Prolonged applause as the gavel was presented to Dean E. G. Williamson ...

PRESIDENT WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Past President. I am not quite sure what you mean by using that figure of "reins." These are not horses; these are men and women. I am not going to use the reins or the whip either -- at least not tonight. (Laughter)

Fellow Deans and friends of students, I confess, Glen, that while you were giving your presidential address the other day I was outlining my next year's presidential address. (Laughter) Not because I was not following you, but because you stimulated me and provoked me to think along some new lines, and I appreciate that very much. At my age I need a little help to get a speech every once in awhile.

Personally, I have always been proud and lucky and grateful that I stumbled into this field of

work, without benefit of counseling. (Laughter) I am now inordinately proud to have become your President. I shall try to make this a year of tension and crises. (Laughter) But I promise you that they will be joyful crises, learning crises, and that they will not cause you to apply for a sabbatical leave from your deanship.

We do live in exciting days. I would not have missed this decade for anything. I am grateful that I have been able to live this far -- or should I say, endure and survive this far, because that is our criterion, as you know.

I hope that we will have as good a year in moving our field, or part of our field of higher education forward, as Glen and his associates have moved it this far this year. I think it has been a remarkable year of progress, in delineating our responsibilities and opportunities, and in committing ourselves to helping young people mature into the kind of humane persons of which their Alma Maters can be proud.

Pax vobiscum. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I would like to try to make amends for one very serious oversight in making introductions, in that I did not recognize Father Lawrence Donohue, Dean of Men at Seattle University, and one of the work horses of this Conference.

Are there announcements, Tom?

DEAN EMMET: You can tell them where the buses are.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: The buses await you somewhere in the general neighborhood where they let you out. (Laughter) Tom is down there squirming because it is costing him \$60.00 an hour for them to sit down there. Now, we are not trying to rush you away. (Laughter) I am not; Tom is. (Laughter)

I am not sure I have the authority to do this, but I am going to presume to take it, President Ed, and adjourn the 48th Annual Conference of NASPA. (Applause)

... The 48th Anniversary Conference adjourned at nine-fifty o'clock ...

## APPENDIX A

### REPORT OF THE SECRETARY March 16, 1965 - June 1, 1966

This brief report since the last annual conference bears credence to the fact that this Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs is on the move.

#### Membership

Institutional - Ten years ago	Member Institutions	271
Five years ago	Member Institutions	344
Last year	Member Institutions	443
THIS YEAR	Member Institutions	462

<u>Individual Affiliation</u>	<u>Last Year</u>	<u>To Date</u>
Voting Delegates	443	462
Institutional Delegates	127	176
Associates	31	96
Student Affiliates	32	39
	<u>633</u>	<u>773</u>

(The NASPA Rosters dated June 1, 1966, denote new member institutions plus new individual affiliates)

#### Publications

The NASPA Journal has been more than successful. Editor Richard Siggelkow, his editorial board and all contributors deserve an accolade. The recent Index was a praiseworthy project. Growing requests from other publications to re-print NASPA articles indicates rapid maturity. Pride in this project is well-founded.

Proceedings (all 440 pages) of the 47th Anniversary Conference were sent to conference participants, voting delegates not in attendance, subscribing libraries and to about 40 individual orders.

The "Directory of Student Personnel and Related Organizations in Colleges and Universities" (Dean Donald Winbigler) and a "Directory of National Student Organizations" (Dean Glen Nygreen) were distributed to all voting delegates and affiliates. Individual sales have been made. The combination of these two publications may occur soon.

Bulletin #1 "Inservice Education for College Student Personnel" (John W. Truitt and Richard A. Gross) has just appeared with a June, 1966 date. Congratulations are in order to the NASPA Division of Professional Development and Standards as well as to Editor Richard A. Siggelkow.

## The Executive Committee

The NASPA Executive Committee has held four working sessions since the last conference. Minutes are on file for the meetings of June 7-8, 1965, October 18-19, 1965, January 24-25, 1966, and April 2-3, 1966. Reorganizational plans adopted at the Washington Conference have progressed smoothly with the elected Regional Vice Presidents and three of the four important Divisions functioning productively. An Ad Hoc Committee re Central Office and Budget via the Executive Committee should have an interesting proposal to report to the annual business meeting. A timely and significant project with governmental support may be finalized in time for release at the Conference.

## General

NASPA has been represented at the meetings of many national associations. Various inaugurations, installations, and dedications have had designated representatives of the Association in attendance. This has been a vigorous and fast-paced year marked with changes on member campuses as well as changes within NASPA. Services to member institutions and to individual affiliates continue to increase. Because of the late June Conference dates, NASPA Placement Service operated in conjunction with the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors in Washington, D. C. on April 2-3, 1966.

To the many secretaries of NASPA Deans throughout the country and to those Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs who give so willingly of their personal time and effort the Officers and the Executive Committee submits a heartfelt THANK YOU.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl W. Knox  
Secretary - NASPA

P.S.: Thank you, Mrs. Virginia Drake.

### INTERIM TREASURER'S REPORT

MARCH 15, 1965 THROUGH JUNE 1, 1966

(Auditor's Statement Available After Fiscal Year)

BALANCE ON HAND MARCH 15, 1965	\$ 9,440.69
--------------------------------	-------------

## RECEIPTS

1965 Conference Receipts	\$14,989.31	
Dues Received	26,620.00	
Sale of Proceedings	97.00	
Miscellaneous Receipts (Journal, Directory, Etc.)	<u>758.25</u>	<u>42,464.56</u>
Total Receipts		\$51,905.25

## DISBURSEMENTS

### Conference Expenses

1965 Conference Expense	\$13,599.47
1965 Book Exhibit Pamphlet	298.50
1965 Proceedings	4,396.23
1966 Conference Expense	613.92
Conference Chairman Fund -	
1966 Conference	1,200.00
1966 Book Exhibit	25.00
1970 Conference	<u>145.35</u>

Total Conference Expenses \$20,278.47

### Executive Committee Expenses

President's Fund	\$ 300.00
Executive Committee Exp.	9,931.69
Division Expenses	3,469.30
NASPA representation at	
meetings, etc.	1,521.33
Budget and Central	
Office Comm.	189.26
Individual mailings by	
regional vice presidents	<u>288.98</u>

Total Executive Committee Expenses 15,700.56

### Secretary-Treasurer

Postage	\$ 147.45
Telephone	849.14
Stenographic Services	582.00
Printing & Mimeographing	1,197.54
Books	14.00
1965 Bonding of Treasurer	62.50
1965 Audit	350.00
IRS - Auditor's Services	125.00
IBM Typewriter	<u>197.26</u>

Total Secretary-Treasurer's Expenses 3,524.89

### Dues Expenses

American Council Dues	\$ 300.00
COSPA Dues	<u>50.00</u>
Total Dues Expenses	350.00

Journal 6,208.00

Directory - Student Personnel and  
Related Organizations in Colleges  
and Universities 392.45

Directory - National Student Organi-  
zations in Colleges & Universities 387.50

COSPA Brochure 125.00

President's Plaque 120.00

Miscellaneous Expenses 95.58

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS 47,182.45

BALANCE ON HAND JUNE 1, 1966 \$ 4,722.80

## APPENDIX B

### ROSTER OF MEMBERS

June 1, 1966

#### Voting Delegates

Adelphi Suffolk Coll.	William J. Condon	Oakdale, L.I., N.Y.
Adelphi University	Roger A. Wingett	Garden City, N.Y.
Adrian College	Cody Meadows	Adrian, Michigan
Akron, Univ. of	Richard L. Hansford	Akron, Ohio
*Alabama College	James Wilkinson	Montevallo, Ala.
*Alabama, Univ. of	John Blackburn	University, Ala.
*Alaska, Univ. of	L. E. Haines	College, Alaska
Albion College	Charles M. Leeds	Albion, Michigan
Alfred University	Paul F. Powers	Alfred, New York
Allegheny College	John McKean	Meadville, Pa.
Alma College	Fred W. Smith	Alma, Michigan
American Inter- national College	James A. Brennan	Springfield, Mass.
American University	C. W. Van Way, Jr.	Washington, D. C.
*Amherst College	Wm. L. Swartzbaugh	Amherst, Mass.
Anderson College	Norman Beard	Anderson, Indiana
Andrews University	Frank Knittel	Berrien Springs, Michigan
Arizona State Univ.	W. P. Shofstall	Tempe, Arizona
*Arizona, Univ. of	Robert S. Svob	Tucson, Arizona
*Arkansas State Coll.	Robert Moore	State College, Ark.
Arkansas, Univ. of	D. Whitney Halladay	Fayetteville, Ark.
Ashland College	George M. Guiley	Ashland, Ohio
*Auburn University	James E. Foy	Auburn, Alabama
*Augsburg College	Glen W. Johnson	Minneapolis, Minn.
*Augustana College	Jorgen S. Thompson	Sioux Falls, S.Dak.
Baker University	Benjamin A. Gessner	Baldwin, Kansas
Ball State Teachers College	Merrill C. Beyerl	Muncie, Indiana
*Baylor University	W. C. Perry	Waco, Texas
Baldwin-Wallace Coll.	Robert W. Pitcher	Berea, Ohio
Bellarmino College	Hilary H. Gottbrath	Louisville, Kentucky
*Beloit College	John P. Gwin	Beloit, Wisconsin
Berea College	James Orwig	Berea, Kentucky
Berry College	E. B. Hatcher	Mount Berry, Georgia
Bethany College	Robert A. Sandercox	Bethany, W. Virginia
*Boston College	George L. Drury	Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Boston University	Staton Curtis	Boston, Mass.
Bowdoin College	A. L. Greason, Jr.	Brunswick, Maine
Bowling Green State U.	Wallace W. Taylor	Bowling Green, Ohio
*Bradley University	Leslie Tucker	Peoria, Illinois
Bridgeport, Univ. of	Alfred R. Wolff	Bridgeport, Conn.
*Brigham Young Univ.	J. Elliot Cameron	Provo, Utah
Brown University	Donald E. Walsh	Providence, Rhode Island

\*Denotes attendance at 1966 Conference

*Bucknell University	John Hayward	Lewisburg, Pa.
Buena Vista College	W. D. Wesselink	Storm Lake, Iowa
*Butler University	Herbert Schwomeyer	Indianapolis, Ind.
California Institute of Technology	Paul C. Eaton	Pasadena, Cal.
*California State Coll.	Lyle Edmison	Hayward, Cal.
California State Coll.	George D. Demos	Long Beach, Cal.
*California State Polytechnic College	Everett M. Chandler	San Luis Obispo, Cal.
*California, Univ. of	Arleigh Williams	Berkeley, Cal.
*California, Univ. of	James D. Andrews	Davis, Cal.
*California, Univ. of	Charles T. McClure	Los Angeles, Cal.
*California, Univ. of Santa Barbara Coll.	Lyle G. Reynolds	Goleta, Cal.
California, Univ. of	A. T. Brugger	Riverside, Cal.
California, Univ. of (Medical Center)	Willard C. Fleming	San Francisco, Cal.
*California Western U.	William E. Clarke	San Diego, Cal.
Calvin College	Philip R. Lucasse	Grand Rapids, Mich.
*Canisius College	Edward B. Gillen	Buffalo, New York
Capital University	John Kirker	Columbus, Ohio
Carleton College	Merrill E. Jarchow	Northfield, Minn.
Carnegie Institute of Technology	George Brown	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
*Carroll College	Charles W. Cook	Waukesha, Wisconsin
*Carthage College	John F. Courter	Kenosha, Wisconsin
Case Institute of Tech.	Thomas E. Baker	Cleveland, Ohio
Catholic Univ. of Amer.	James J. McPadden	Washington, D. C.
*Central Michigan Univ.	C. Milton Pike	Mt. Pleasant, Mich.
Central Missouri State College	W. O. Hampton	Warrensburg, Mo.
*Central State Coll.	Charles H. Richmond	Edmond, Oklahoma
*Central Washington State College	John Silva	Ellensburg, Wash.
Centre College of Kentucky	Max P. Cavnies	Danville, Kentucky
*Chattanooga, Univ. of	Robert C. Mildram	Chattanooga, Tenn.
*Chicago, The Univ. of	Warner A. Wick	Chicago, Illinois
*Chico State College	Donald R. Gerth	Chico, California
*Cincinnati, Univ. of	William Nester	Cincinnati, Ohio
*City College of N.Y.	William W. Blaesser	New York, N.Y.
Clarkson College of Technology	Henry E. McAdams	Potsdam, New York
Clemson University	Walter T. Cox	Clemson, So. Carolina
Coe College	John A. Wilkinson	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Colby College	George T. Nickerson	Waterville, Maine
Colgate University	William F. Griffith	Hamilton, New York
*Coll. of the Holy Cross	Charles J. Dunn	Worcester, Mass.
Coll. of St. Mary of The Springs	James F. Cooney	Columbus, Ohio
Colorado College	Juan Reid	Colo. Springs, Colo.
*Colorado School of Mines	Francis E. Smiley	Golden, Colorado
*Colo. State College	Norman T. Oppelt	Greeley, Colorado
*Colo. State Univ.	Burns B. Crookston	Ft. Collins, Colo.



Colorado, Univ. of	Glenn Barnett	Boulder, Colo.
Concordia College	Victor C. Boe	Moorhead, Minn.
Concordia Teachers Col.	Kenneth R. Schueler	River Forest, Ill.
*Connecticut, Univ. of	John Dunlop	Storrs, Connecticut
*Cooper Union for the		
Advancement of	Richard S. Ball	Cooper Square,
Science and Art		New York, New York
Cornell College	Stuart J.E. Good	Mt. Vernon, Iowa
Cornell University	Mark Barlow, Jr.	Ithaca, New York
*Creighton University	John J. Halloran	Omaha, Nebraska
Culver-Stockton Coll.	Byron W. Thorsen	Canton, Missouri
Dartmouth College	Thaddeus Seymour	Hanover, N.Hampshire
Dayton, Univ. of	Thomas P. Schick	Dayton, Ohio
*Defiance College	William Reynolds	Defiance, Ohio
Delaware, Univ. of	John E. Hocutt	Newark, Delaware
Denison University	Mark W. Smith	Granville, Ohio
Denver, Univ. of	Dean of Students	Denver, Colo.
DePaul University	T.J. Wangler	Chicago, Illinois
DePauw University	Lawrence A. Riggs	Greencastle, Ind.
*Detroit Institute		
of Technology	James S. Young	Detroit, Michigan
*Detroit, Univ. of	F. A. Arlinghaus	Detroit, Michigan
Dickinson College	Benjamin D. James	Carlisle, Pa.
Doane College	Robert Patterson	Crete, Nebraska
Dominican College	R. J. Feucht	Racine, Wisconsin
*Drake University	Arthur L. Casebeer	Des Moines, Iowa
Drexel Institute of		
Technology	William E. Toombs	Philadelphia, Pa.
Drury College	Randall W. Meyer, Jr.	Springfield, Mo.
*Dubuque, Univ. of	Lewis Furda	Dubuque, Iowa
Duke University	Robert B. Cox	Durham, N.Carolina
Duquesne University	Glenn M. Nelson	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Earlham College	Eric G. Curtis	Richmond, Indiana
Eastern Ill. Univ.	Rudolph D. Anfinson	Charleston, Ill.
*Eastern Michigan Coll.	William C. Lawrence	Ypsilanti, Mich.
*Eastern Montana	Fred R.	
College of Education	Van Valkenburg	Billings, Montana
*Eastern N.Mexico Univ.	Edgar L. Petty	Portales, N.Mexico
*Eastern Wash.State Col.	Daryl Hagie	Cheney, Washington
*East Texas State Coll.	Harold F. Murphy	Commerce, Texas
*Elmhurst College	William F. Denman	Elmhurst, Illinois
*Emory University	David W. Robinson	Emory University,
		Georgia
Evansville College	Robert L. Wilson	Evansville, Ind.
Fairfield University	J.E. McCormick	Fairfield, Conn.
Fairleigh Dickinson U.	Clair W. Black	Rutherford, N.J.
Ferris State College	Donald F. Rankin	Big Rapids, Mich.
Fisk University	Reginald H. Hughes	Nashville, Tenn.
*Florida Agricultural &		
Mechanical Univ.	Warren Shirley	Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida Southern Coll.	Philip R. Campbell	Lakeland, Florida
Florida State Univ.	Harry P. Day	Tallahassee, Fla.
*Florida, Univ. of	Lester L. Hale	Gainesville, Fla.

*Fordham University Fort Hays Kansas State College	Martin J. Meade Bill Jellison	New York, New York Hays, Kansas
*Franklin & Marshall College Francis T. Nichols State College	O. W. Lacy William L. Duncan	Lancaster, Pa. Thibodaux, La.
*Fresno State College  Gannon College	Donald Albright Eldon K. Somers	Fresno, California Erie, Pa.
*General Beadle State College General Motors Inst. Geneva College	Harry P. Bowes Robert S. Yoke Harold A. Bruce	Madison, So. Dakota Flint, Michigan Beaver Falls, Pa.
*Georgetown University *George Washington U. George Williams Coll. Georgia Inst. of Tech. Georgia State College Georgia, Univ. of Gettysburg College	Anthony J. Zeitz Paul F. Bissell John W. Dubocq James Dull Kenneth Englands Daniel J. Sorrells Dean of Students	Washington, D.C. Washington, D.C. Chicago, Illinois Atlanta, Georgia Atlanta, Georgia Athens, Georgia Gettysburg, Pa.
*Gonzaga University Goshen College *Grinnell College Grove City College	William J. Bichsel Russel Liechty S. Eugene Thompson Frederick Kring	Spokane, Wash. Goshen, Indiana Grinnell, Iowa Grove City, Pa.
Hamilton College Hanover College Harvard University Harvey Mudd College Hastings College Hawaii, Univ. of Heidelberg College High Point College Hiram College Hofstra University Hope College	Hadley S. DePuy Glen L. Bonsett John U. Munro Eugene Hotchkiss J.W. Breckenridge Harold Bitner A. M. Thomas F. Lee Edwards Charles Thompson Randall W. Hoffman Thomas Carey William Yardley	Clinton, New York Hanover, Indiana Cambridge, Mass. Claremont, Cal. Hastings, Nebraska Honolulu, Hawaii Tiffin, Ohio High Point, No. Car. Hiram, Ohio Hempstead, New York Holland, Michigan Houston, Texas
*Houston, Univ. of *Howard University *Humboldt State Coll. *Hunter College	A. J. Blackburn Don W. Karshner Glen T. Nygreen	Washington, D. C. Arcata, California The Bronx, N.Y.
Idaho State Univ. *Idaho, Univ. of Illinois Institute of Technology	Mel F. Schubert Charles O. Decker Thomas E. Hogan	Pocatello, Idaho Moscow, Idaho Chicago, Illinois
*Illinois State U. Illinois, Univ. of Illinois, Univ. of Ill. Wesleyan Univ. Indiana State Coll. *Indiana State Univ. *Indiana University *Iowa State Univ. *Iowa, Univ. of	Richard E. Hulet Robert M. Crane Fred H. Turner Donald B. Ruthenberg S. Trevor Hadley John W. Truitt Robert Shaffer M.R. Kratochvil Marion L. Huit	Normal, Illinois Chicago, Illinois Urbana, Illinois Bloomington, Ill. Indiana, Pa. Terre Haute, Ind. Bloomington, Ind. Ames, Iowa Iowa City, Iowa

Jamestown College	T. Franklin Grady	Jamestown, No.Dak.
John B. Stetson Univ.	George W. Hood	DeLand, Florida
*John Carroll Univ.	James M. Lavin	Cleveland, Ohio
Kalamazoo College	Paul E. Collins	Kalamazoo, Mich.
*Kansas State College of Pittsburg	Ralph Wright	Pittsburg, Kansas
Kansas State Teachers College	John R. Webb	Emporia, Kansas
*Kansas State Univ.	Chester E. Peters	Manhattan, Kansas
*Kansas, Univ. of	Laurence C. Woodruff	Lawrence, Kansas
*Kansas Wesleyan Univ.	Aubrey Forrest	Salina, Kansas
Kent State Univ.	Eric Rackham	Kent, Ohio
Kentucky, Univ. of	Kenneth E. Harper	Lexington, Kentucky
Kenyon College	Thomas J. Edwards	Gambier, Ohio
Knox College	Wilbur F. Pillsbury	Galesburg, Ill.
Lafayette College	Armand L. Shaner	Easton, Pa.
Lake Forest College	Howard Hoogesteger	Lake Forest, Ill.
Lamar College	D. L. Bost	Beaumont, Texas
Laval, Universite	Jean-Charles Bouffard	Quebec, Canada
Lawrence College	Kenneth Venderbush	Appleton, Wisconsin
Lehigh University	Charles Brennan	Bethlehem, Pa.
*LeMoyne College	John F. Blasi	Syracuse, New York
Lenoir Rhyne College	Robert L. Duncan	Hickory, No.Car.
Lewis & Clark College	Hester Turner	Portland, Oregon
Lewis College	Robert F. McFadden	Lockport, Ill.
Lock Haven State Coll.	Francis J. Cornelius	Lock Haven, Pa.
Long Island Univ., Brooklyn Center	Gary Rosenthal	Brooklyn, New York
Long Island Univ., C.W. Post Coll. of	Fred S. Demarr	Greenvale, N.Y.
Loras College	Eugene C. Kutsch	Dubuque, Iowa
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	S. X. Lewis	Ruston, Louisiana
*Louisiana State Univ.	Arden O. French	Baton Rouge, La.
*Louisiana State Univ.	Edgar E. Burks	New Orleans, La.
Louisville, Univ. of	Dave Lawrence	Louisville, Ky.
*Loyola College	Donald F. Young	Montreal, Canada
*Loyola College	Frank C. Bourbon	Baltimore, Md.
*Loyola University	Harry McCloskey	Chicago, Illinois
*Loyola Univ. of L.A.	Richard W. Rolfs	Los Angeles, Cal.
Loyola Univ. of N.O.	Daniel W. Partridge	New Orleans, La.
*Luther College	Erling Naeseth	Decorah, Iowa
*Lycoming College	Jack C. Buckle	Williamsport, Pa.
MacMurray College	Robert K. Thomas	Jacksonville, Ill.
Maine, Univ. of	John E. Stewart	Orono, Maine
Malone College	Keith A. Bell	Canton, Ohio
*Manhattan College	Barnabas Edward	New York, N.Y.
*Mankato State Coll.	Norbert K. Baumgart	Mankato, Minn.
*Marietta College	Walter L. Hobba	Marietta, Ohio
*Marshall University	John E. Shay, Jr.	Huntington, W.Va.
*Marquette University	Wayne F. Tinkle	Milwaukee, Wis.
Maryknoll Seminary	John K. Halbert	Glen Ellyn, Ill.

Maryland, Univ. of	Francis A. Gray, Jr.	College Park, Md.
Massachusetts Insti-		
tute of Technology	Kenneth Wadleigh	Cambridge, Mass.
Massachusetts, Univ. of	William F. Field	Amherst, Mass.
McNeese State College	Ellis Guillory	Lake Charles, La.
*Medical College of Va.	Franklin Bacon	Richmond, Va.
Memphis State Univ.	Edward D. McDaniel	Memphis, Tennessee
Mercer University	Helen Glenn	Macon, Georgia
*Miami University	Robert Etheridge	Oxford, Ohio
Miami, Univ. of	William R. Butler	Coral Gables, Fla.
Michigan State Univ.	Jack Fuzak	E. Lansing, Mich.
*Michigan Tech. Univ.	Harold Meese	Houghton, Mich.
Michigan, Univ. of	Richard A. Cutler	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Middlebury College	Geo. Dennis O'Brien	Middlebury, Vt.
*Midwestern University	James Stewart	Wichita Falls, Tex.
Millikin University	Byron L. Kerns	Decatur, Illinois
*Minnesota, Univ. of-		
Duluth Branch	C.W. Wood	Duluth, Minnesota
*Minnesota, Univ. of	E. G. Williamson	Minneapolis, Minn.
Mississippi, Univ. of	Franklin E. Moak	University, Miss.
Missouri, Univ. of	Jack Matthews	Columbia, Mo.
*Missouri, Univ. of	Wheadon Bloch	Kansas City, Mo.
at Kansas City		
*Missouri, Univ. of	Sam Burton	Rolla, Missouri
at Rolla		
*Monmouth College	Elwood H. Ball	Monmouth, Ill.
*Monmouth College	Thomas F. Murtha	W. Long Branch, New Jersey
Montana State College	Edward L. Hanson	Bozeman, Montana
*Montana State Univ.	Andrew Cogswell	Missoula, Mont.
Montclair State Coll.	Lawton W. Blanton	Montclair, N.J.
*Moorhead State Coll.	Noble Hendrix	Moorhead, Minn.
Moravian College	George H. Stanley	Bethlehem, Pa.
Morris Harvey Coll.	Frank J. Krebs	Charleston, W.Va.
*Mount Union College	Terence S. Taylor	Alliance, Ohio
*Muhlenberg College	Claude Dierolf	Allentown, Pa.
*Muskingum College	Kenneth Potter	New Concord, Ohio
Nasson College	Robert D. Witherill	Springvale, Maine
Nebraska, Univ. of	G. Robert Ross	Lincoln, Nebraska
*Nevada, Univ. of	Sam Basta	Reno, Nevada
Newark College of		
Engineering	S. J. House	Newark, New Jersey
Newark State College	Herbert W. Samenfeld	Union, New Jersey
New Hampshire, Univ. of	C. Robert Keesey	Durham, N.H.
New Mexico Highlands U.	Ray A. Farmer	Las Vegas, N.Mex.
New Mexico State Univ.	Philip S. Ambrose	University Park, New Mexico
*New Mexico, Univ. of	Howard V. Mathany	Albuquerque, N.Mex.
New York Univ.	Phil Price	New York, N.Y.
*North Carolina		
State University	James J. Stewart, Jr.	Raleigh, No. Car.
North Carolina, Univ. of	C. O. Cathey	Chapel Hill, N. Car.
North Carolina, Univ. of	Donald M. MacKay	Charlotte, N. Car.
North Dakota State U.	Daniel R. Leasure	Fargo, No. Dakota
North Dakota, Univ. of	Ronald E. Barnes	Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Northeast Missouri State Teachers Coll.	Henry M. Boucher	Kirksville, Mo.
*Northeastern Univ.	Gilbert MacDonald	Boston, Mass.
*Northern Ill. Univ.	Ernest E. Hanson	DeKalb, Illinois
*Northern Michigan U.	Allan L. Niemi	Marquette, Mich.
Northern Montana Coll.	Richard C. Mattson	Havre, Montana
Northern State Coll.	J. A. Wettstein	Aberdeen, So.Dak.
*Northland College	James R. Davies	Ashland, Wisconsin
Northwest Missouri State College	C. E. Koerble	Maryville, Mo.
*Northwestern Univ.	James C. McLeod	Evanston, Ill.
Notre Dame, Univ. of	Charles McCarragher	Notre Dame, Ind.
Northwestern State Coll.	Richard B. Caple	Alva, Oklahoma
Oakland University	Thomas B. Dutton	Rochester, Mich.
Oberlin College	Bernard S. Adams	Oberlin, Ohio
Occidental College	John S. McAnally	Los Angeles, Cal.
Ohio State University	John T. Bonner, Jr.	Columbus, Ohio
Ohio University	James Whalen	Athens, Ohio
Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Ronald S. Stead	Delaware, Ohio
Okla. Baptist Univ.	Donald G. Osborn	Shawnee, Oklahoma
*Oklahoma State Univ.	F. E. McFarland	Stillwater, Okla.
Oklahoma, Univ. of	W. Rex Brown	Norman, Oklahoma
Omaha, Univ. of	Don J. Pflasterer	Omaha, Nebraska
*Oregon State College	Robert Chick	Corvallis, Oregon
*Oregon, Univ. of	Don M. DuShane	Eugene, Oregon
Oregon College of Education	Jack D. Morton	Monmouth, Oregon
*Ottawa, Univ. of	Jean G. Archambault	Ottawa, Canada
Pace College	Walter E. Joyce	New York, New York
Pacific University	Charles Trombley	Forest Grove, Ore.
Pacific, Univ. of the	Edward S. Betz	Stockton, Cal.
Pembroke State Coll.	James B. Ebert	Pembroke, N. Car.
*Pennsylvania State U.	Frank Simes	Univ. Park, Pa.
Pennsylvania, Univ. of	James P. Craft, Jr.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Pepperdine College	Jennings Davis, Jr.	Los Angeles, Cal.
Pittsburgh, Univ. of	William B. Crafts	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Henry Q. Middendorf	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pomona College	Shelton L. Beatty	Claremont, Cal.
*Portland State Coll.	Channing Briggs	Portland, Oregon
Princeton University	William Lippincott	Princeton, N.J.
*Principia, The	Allen C. Brooks	Elsah, Illinois
*Purdue University	O. D. Roberts	Lafayette, Ind.
*Quincy College	Mel Doyle	Quincy, Illinois
Queens College	James R. Kreuzer	Flushing, N.Y.
*Redlands, Univ. of	James D. Paisley	Redlands, Cal.
Regis College	Thomas F. Finucane	Denver, Colo.
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Ira Harrod	Troy, New York
Rhode Island, Univ. of	Edward C. McGuire	Kingston, R.I.
Rice University	Paul E. Pfeiffer	Houston, Texas

Richmond Prof. Institute (Coll. of William and Mary)	Richard E. MacDougall	Richmond, Virginia
Richmond, Univ. of	C. J. Gray	Richmond, Va.
Rider College	James M. McRoberts	Trenton, N.J.
*Ripon College	David L. Harris	Ripon, Wisconsin
Roanoke College	Donald M. Sutton	Salem, Virginia
Rochester Institute of Technology	James B. Campbell	Rochester, N.Y.
*Rochester, Univ. of	Joseph Cole	Rochester, N.Y.
Rockford College	Stanley J. Gross	Rockford, Ill.
Rollins College	Fred W. Hicks	Winter Park, Fla.
*Roosevelt University	George H. Watson	Chicago, Illinois
*Rutgers-The State Univ.	Earle W. Clifford	New Brunswick, N.J.
Sacramento State Coll.	Donald Bailey	Sacramento, Cal.
*St. Cloud State Coll.	Dale Patton	St. Cloud, Minn.
St. John Fisher Coll.	Herbert Wilshire	Rochester, N.Y.
*St. John's University	Finian McDonald	Collegeville, Minn.
St. John's University	George N. Kollintzas	Jamaica, New York
St. Joseph's College	Joseph M. Geib	Philadelphia, Pa.
St. Lawrence Univ.	Walter H. Baumhoff	Canton, New York
*St. Louis University	Thomas F. McQueeney	St. Louis, Mo.
*St. Mary's College	J. Francis Walsh	Winona, Minnesota
*St. Olaf College	Mark Almli	Northfield, Minn.
St. Peter's College	Thomas V. Maguire	Jersey City, N.J.
San Diego State Coll.	Herbert C. Peiffer, Jr.	San Diego, Cal.
San Fernando Valley State College	John T. Palmer	Northridge, Cal.
San Francisco State College	Ferd Reddell	San Francisco, California
*San Francisco, University of	John LoSchiavo	San Francisco, California
*San Jose State Coll.	Stanley Benz	San Jose, Cal.
Santa Clara, Univ.	Wm. B. Perkins	Santa Clara, Cal.
Savannah State Coll.	N. R. Freeman	Savannah, Georgia
Scranton, Univ. of	Henry Butler	Scranton, Pa.
*Seattle University	Robert J. Rebhahn	Seattle, Wash.
Shepherd College	Loyd Bates	Shepherdstown, W. Va.
Shimer College	Esther Weinstein	Mt. Carroll, Ill.
Shippensburg State Col.	John Hubley	Shippensburg, Pa.
*Simpson College	Waller B. Wiser	Indianola, Iowa
*Sir George Williams U.	Magnus Flynn	Montreal, Canada
Slippery Rock State College	Herbert G. McGibbeny	Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
So. Carolina, Univ. of	Charles H. Witten	Columbia, So. Car.
*South Dakota, State University of	Howard Connors	Vermillion, S. Dak.
Southeast Missouri State College	Dean of Students	Cape Girardeau, Missouri
Southeastern Louisiana College	L. E. Chandler	Hammond, La.
*Southern California, University of	Paul A. Bloland	Los Angeles, California
*Southern Illinois U.	Jack W. Graham	Carbondale, Ill.
*Southern Methodist U.	Fred W. Bryson	Dallas, Texas

Southern Mississippi, University of	J. R. Switzer	Hattiesburg, Miss.
*South Florida, The University of	Herbert J. Wunderlich	Tampa, Florida
Southwestern Louisiana, University of	E. Glynn Abel	Lafayette, La.
*Southwestern Univ.	William D. Swift	Georgetown, Texas
*Spring Arbor College	James L. Chapman	Spring Arbor, Mich.
Springfield College	Helen S. Werner	Springfield, Mass.
Spring Hill College	Hilton Rivet	Spring Hill, Ala.
*Stanford University	H. Donald Winbigler	Stanford, Cal.
*State College of Iowa	Edward Voldseth	Cedar Falls, Iowa
State Univ. of New York	Clifton C. Thorne	Albany, New York
State Univ. of N.Y. at Binghamton	John P. Belniak	Binghamton, N.Y.
Harpur College		
State Univ. of N.Y.	Oliver C. Spaulding	Brockport, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y. Maritime College	Arthur J. Spring	Bronx, New York
*State Univ. of N.Y.	Richard Siggelkow	Buffalo, New York
State Univ. of N.Y.	Hugh A. Quinn	Canton, New York
State Univ. of N.Y.	Stanley Metzger	Cortland, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y.	Robert E. Coon	Fredonia, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y.	Gerald Saddlemire	Geneseo, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y.	Robert W. Rock	Oswego, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y.	W. C. Flynt	Plattsburg, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y.	Thomas M. Barrington	Potsdam, N.Y.
State Univ. of N.Y.	David Tilley	Stony Brook, N.Y.
Stephen F. Austin State College	R. A. Sininger	Nacogdoches, Texas
Steubenville, Coll. of	Dennis Sullivan	Steubenville, Ohio
Stevens Institute of Technology	William Bingham	Hoboken, N. Jersey
Susquehanna Univ.	Tam Polson	Selinsgrove, Pa.
Syracuse University	Jim G. Carleton	Syracuse, N.Y.
Tarkio College	Osborne Parker	Tarkio, Missouri
Taylor University	Henry Nelson	Upland, Indiana
*Temple University	Carl M. Grip	Philadelphia, Pa.
Tennessee A & I State University	J. A. Payne, Jr.	Nashville, Tenn.
Tennessee, Univ. of	Charles L. Lewis	Knoxville, Tenn.
*Tennessee Wesleyan Col.	Floyd Bowling	Athens, Tennessee
Texas A & M Univ.	James Hannigan	College Station, Tex.
*Texas Christian Univ.	Howard G. Wible, Jr.	Ft. Worth, Texas
Texas Tech. Coll.	James G. Allen	Lubbock, Texas
*Texas, Univ. of	Jack Holland	Austin, Texas
Texas, The Univ. of Medical Branch	Kenneth P. Walker	Galveston, Texas
Thiel College	Roy A. Moss	Greenville, Pa.
Toledo, Univ. of	Donald S. Parks	Toledo, Ohio
Trenton State Coll.	Wilton Pruitt	Trenton, N. Jersey
*Trinity College	Roy Heath	Hartford, Conn.



Trinity University	J. C. Pool	San Antonio, Tex.
*Tufts University	Alvin R. Schmidt	Medford, Mass.
*Tulane University	John H. Stibbs	New Orleans, La.
Tulsa, Univ. of	H. N. Carter	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Tuskegee Institute	P. B. Phillips	Tuskegee Institute, Alabama
*Union College	Edward Pollock	Schenectady, N.Y.
Upsala College	Raymond O. Eddy	E. Orange, N. Jersey
Utah, Univ. of	Virginia P. Frobes	Salt Lake City, Ut.
Valparaiso Univ.	Luther Koepke	Valparaiso, Ind.
Vanderbilt Univ.	Sidney F. Boutwell	Nashville, Tenn.
*Vermont, Univ. of	Roland D. Patzer	Burlington, Vt.
Villanova Univ.	Richard D. Appicci	Villanova, Pa.
*Virginia Polytechnic Institute	James W. Dean	Blacksburg, Va.
Virginia, Univ. of	B.F.D. Runk	Charlottesville, Virginia
Wabash College	Norman C. Moore	Crawfordsville, Ind.
Wagner College	John Hruby	Staten Island, N.Y.
Washburn Univ. of Topeka	Ray B. Loeschner	Topeka, Kansas
Washington & Jefferson College	Frederick J. Frank	Washington, Pa.
*Washington & Lee U.	Edward C. Atwood, Jr.	Lexington, Va.
Washington College	Walter J. Babb	Chestertown, Md.
*Washington State U.	J. C. Clevenger	Pullman, Wash.
Washington University	Arno Haack	St. Louis, Mo.
*Washington, Univ. of	Donald K. Anderson	Seattle, Wash.
Waterloo Univ. Coll.	Frederick J. Speckeen	Waterloo, Ont., Canada
Waterloo, Univ. of	W. G. Scott	Waterloo, Ont., Canada
Wayland Baptist Coll.	S. L. Harris	Plainview, Texas
*Wayne State Univ.	Harold Stewart	Detroit, Mich.
Wesleyan Univ.	Stanley J. Idzerda	Middletown, Conn.
W. Chester State Coll.	Jack A. Owens	West Chester, Pa.
*Western Illinois Univ.	G. R. Schwartz	Macomb, Illinois
Western Maryland Coll.	James E. Robinson	Westminster, Md.
*Western Michigan Univ.	Paul L. Griffeth	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Western New England College	Eugene H. Floyd	Springfield, Massachusetts
*Western Reserve Univ.	Russell A. Griffin	Cleveland, Ohio
*Western Washington State College	M. S. Kuder	Bellingham, Washington
Westminster College	John E. Marshall	Fulton, Missouri
Westminster College	Graham M. Ireland	New Wilmington, Pa.
*Westmont College	Orley R. Herron, Jr.	Santa Barbara, Cal.
West Virginia Insti- tute of Technology	Neil Baisi	Montgomery, West Virginia
*West Virginia Univ.	Joseph C. Gluck	Morgantown, W. Va.
West Virginia Wesleyan College	R. A. Cunningham	Buckhannon, W. Va.



Wheaton College	Richard Gross	Wheaton, Ill.
Wheeling College	William K. McGroarty	Wheeling, W.Va.
Whitworth College	Robert L. McCleery	Spokane, Wash.
*Wichita State Univ.	James Rhatigan	Wichita, Kansas
Willamette Univ.	Walter S. Blake, Jr.	Salem, Oregon
William and Mary,	Carson Barnes, Jr.	Williamsburg,
College of		Virginia
William Carey Coll.	Albert G. Green	Hattiesburg, Miss.
Wilmington College	Ross Ekstrom	Wilmington, Ohio
Windsor, Univ. of	R. Paul Gilmer	Windsor, Ont., Can.
*Wisconsin State Univ.	I. W. Schaffer	Whitewater, Wis.
*Wisconsin State Univ.	Ormsby L. Harry	Eau Claire, Wis.
*Wisconsin State Univ.	William Stielstra	Stevens Point, Wis.
Wisconsin, Univ. of	Joseph F. Kauffman	Madison, Wis.
Wisconsin, Univ. of	Robert E. Norris	Milwaukee, Wis.
*Wittenberg University	Robert Long	Springfield, Ohio
Wooster, College of	Ralph A. Young	Wooster, Ohio
Worcester Polytechnic	Martin C.	Worcester, Mass.
Institute	Van de Visse	
*Wyoming, Univ. of	R. E. Kinder	Laramie, Wyoming
*Xavier University	P. H. Ratterman	Cincinnati, Ohio

\*Denotes attendance at 1966 Conference

## INSTITUTIONAL DELEGATES

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| *Abernethy, Bradford S.<br>116 College Avenue<br>New Brunswick, New Jersey  | Bowman, V. J., Dr.<br>Dean of Men<br>Kansas State Teachers College<br>Emporia, Kansas                        |
| Adams, Donald, Director<br>Division of Residence Programs<br>Michigan State University<br>East Lansing, Michigan                                    | Boxhill, Carlton J.<br>Rutgers-The State University<br>New Brunswick, New Jersey                             |
| Allen, Donovan Jay<br>Asst. Dean of Students &<br>Director of Scholarships &<br>Financial Aids Office<br>Indiana University<br>Bloomington, Indiana | *Brown, C. William<br>Asst. Dean of Men<br>Purdue University<br>Lafayette, Indiana                           |
| *Anderson, Carl E.<br>Assoc. Dean of Students<br>Howard University<br>Washington, D. C.   | *Brown, Lyle<br>Assistant Dean of Men<br>University of Denver<br>Denver, Colorado                            |
| Atkinson, Byron H.<br>Dean of Students<br>Univ. of California<br>Los Angeles, Calif.  | Brown, Naomi<br>Dean of Women<br>Miami University<br>Oxford, Ohio  |
| *Baccus, Ira B., Asst. to the<br>B.P. of Student Affairs<br>Michigan State University<br>East Lansing, Michigan                                     | *Bunn, Peter<br>Assistant to the Dean<br>University of Wisconsin<br>Madison, Wisconsin                       |
| Bartol, Robert<br>Fraternity Housing Adviser<br>Eastern Michigan University<br>Ypsilanti, Michigan  | Burkhardt, William H., Jr.<br>Assistant Dean of Men<br>University of Massachusetts<br>Amherst, Massachusetts |
| Baumhoff, Walter H.<br>Dean of Students<br>St. Lawrence University<br>Canton, New York  | Bush, Charles<br>Supervisor, Off-Campus Housing<br>Howard University<br>Washington, D. C.                    |
| *Baysore, Jerry<br>Asst. Dean of Men<br>University of Denver<br>Denver, Colorado  | Cargill, James D.<br>Office of Student Affairs<br>Clemson University<br>Clemson, South Carolina              |
| Beer, Ronald<br>Dean of Men<br>Kent State University<br>Kent, Ohio  | Carlisle, Arthur E.<br>Director of Housing<br>University of Rhode Island<br>Kingston, Rhode Island           |
| Bell, Robert D.<br>Asst. Dean of Students<br>C. W. Post College<br>Greenvale, New York  | Cary, James L.<br>Associate Dean of Students<br>Howard University<br>Washington, D. C.                       |

Caulk, Richard A. Director of Chautauqua Hall State University College at Fredonia Fredonia, New York	Davis, Howard Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Illinois
Chambers, Glen A. 39 Darrow Drive Baltimore, Maryland	Davis, I. Clark Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois
Conrad, D. Irving Asst. to the Dean of Students American International College Springfield, Massachusetts	Delcamp, Sam Assoc. Director of Stu. Affairs Taylor University Upland, Indiana
Cooper, L. Eugene Dean of Men Univ. of South Carolina Columbia, South Carolina	Dell, Don 6801 Meadowbrook Boulevard Apt. 350 Minneapolis, Minnesota
Corey, James D. Director, Counseling Center Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois	DiGerlando, I. Michael Assistant Coordinator Student Activities State University of New York Buffalo, New York
Critchfield, Jack B. University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pa.	Dischinger, George L. Director of Admissions The University of Rochester Rochester, New York
*Crosby, Howard J. Livingston Hall Rutgers University Campus New Brunswick, New Jersey	Dobens, Frederick A. Asst. to the Dean of Men and Adviser to Fraternities Rutgers New Brunswick, New Jersey
Cummins, Emery Assoc. Dean of Students Wheaton College Wheaton, Illinois	Dolan, Anne Dean of Women Univ. of San Francisco San Francisco, California
Curl, Jerry Director of Student Financial Aid Illinois State University Normal, Illinois	Dorais, Richard University of Detroit Detroit, Michigan
Curtis, Kenneth L., Jr. Asst. Dean of Men Northern Illinois Univ. DeKalb, Illinois	Eastment, George T. Dean of Men Manhattan College Bronx, New York
*Darrow, Carroll L. Assoc. Dean of Students Univ. of California Los Angeles, California	Eichhorn, Oscar J., Jr. Dean of Men University of Denver Denver, Colorado

Elsey, R. W. Asst. to the Dean of Mer Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana	Greenleaf, Elizabeth A. Asst. Dean of Students Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana
*Emmet, Thomas A. University of Detroit Detroit, Michigan	Grier, D. J. Assistant Dean of Men Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana
*Ewalt, Robert H. Assistant Dean of Men Washington State University Pullman, Washington	Griffis, Jerrold A. Dean of Men Ohio University Athens, Ohio
Feldkamp, John C. The University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan	*Gruber, James Assistant Director Norton Hall State University of New York Buffalo, New York
Finnegan, Alan D. Jefferson Community College Watertown, New York	Haigazian, Berjoohy Asst. to the Dean of Students Rutgers Coll. of South Jersey Camden, New Jersey
Fischer, Edward J., S.J. Director of Student Counseling St. Peter's College Jersey City, New Jersey	*Hanson, Alan L. 401 Wolfskill Drive Los Angeles, California
Fox, James Dir. of Student Activities Kent State University Kent, Ohio	Hartley, David State University of New York at Albany Albany, New York
Gage, Lawrence Head Resident Wittenberg University Springfield, Ohio	Harvey, L. Jean, Director, Office of Undergraduate Scholarships Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana
Gallarelli, George, S.J. Director of Resident Students Fairfield University Fairfield, Connecticut	Hedgepeth, Gerald Housing Manager The Univ. of Missouri at Rolla Rolla, Missouri
Galvin, James M., C.M. Dean of Men DePaul University Chicago, Illinois	Heldeman, E. Richard Assistant to the President Hunter College New York, New York
*Gillis, John W. Dean of Men Illinois State University Normal, Illinois	Heusinkveld, Edwin D. Asst. Dean of Students Ferris State College Big Rapids, Michigan
*Ginsberg, Paul University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	

Hibbard, George  
Associate Director  
Div'n of Student Activities  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Hirsch, Jerrold I.  
Director, College Center &  
Student Activities  
Newark Coll. of Engineering  
Newark, New Jersey

Hector, Michael B.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
Eastern Illinois University  
Charleston, Illinois

Hollingsworth, William T.  
Dean of Men  
Miami University  
Oxford, Ohio

\*Howell, Joe A.  
Dean of Men  
Southern Methodist University  
Dallas, Texas

\*Hull, Thomas G.  
Dean of Men  
Univ. of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California

\*Husa, Harold E.  
Dean of Men  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, Illinois

Ivers, Richard W.  
Dean of Students  
Lowell Technological Institute  
Lowell, Massachusetts

Jensen, Jerry C.  
Assistant Dean of Men  
Bowling Green State Univ.  
Bowling Green, Ohio

Joiner, William  
Director of Housing  
Univ. of Rhode Island  
Kingston, Rhode Island

King, Howard D., Jr.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
The College of Wooster  
Wooster, Ohio

Kluge, Donald A.  
Dean of Men  
Eastern Illinois University  
Charleston, Illinois

Knapp, William H.  
Associate Director, Division  
of Student Personnel  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, Michigan

\*Knox, Carl W.  
Dean of Men  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

Lafkiotes, C. James  
Director of Univ. Placement  
State Univ. of New York  
Buffalo, New York

\*Lanier, William J.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Wittenberg University  
Springfield, Ohio

Laughlin, Virginia  
Counselor for Student Activ.  
Hunter College  
Bronx, New York

Leafgren, Frederick  
Director of Housing  
Wisconsin State University  
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

Ledbetter, Carl S.  
Dean of Men  
University of Redlands  
Redlands, California

Leemon, Thomas  
Assistant Dean  
Colgate University  
Hamilton, New York

Leveille, David  
Counselor  
Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Linta, Ed, Director of  
Counseling and Testing  
Washburn Univ. of Topeka  
Topeka, Kansas

\*Locklear, William R.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California

MacDougall, Peter R.  
#122 Pollock Hall  
University Park, Pa.

Mallett, Donald R.  
Vice President & Exec. Dean  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana

\*Marsh, J. Don  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, Michigan

Mason, George  
Placement & Financial  
Aid Officer  
Adelphi Suffolk College  
Oakdale, Long Island, N.Y.

\*Matson, Robert E.  
Dean of Men  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio

McBriarty, Charles A.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
Illinois State University  
Normal, Illinois

\*McCartan, Arthur E.  
Dean of Men  
Washington State Univ.  
Pullman, Washington

McDiffett, Kenneth E.  
Associate Dean of Men  
Miami University  
Oxford, Ohio

\*McDonald, Keith H.  
Administrative Student Dean  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, Illinois

\*McEvoy, Joseph J., S.J.  
Dean of Men  
Saint Peter's College  
Jersey City, New Jersey

McGinnis, Benjamin, Director of  
Student Financial Aids  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio

McGrath, Gerard,  
Dean of Men  
University of Santa Clara  
Santa Clara, California

\*McLeod, Thomas A., Director  
Ridgecrest Area Residence Halls  
University of Alabama  
University, Alabama

Meling, Galen R., Director of  
Student Activities  
MacMurray College  
Jacksonville, Illinois

\*Meyer, Elmer, Jr.  
Assistant Dean of  
Students and Director  
The University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin

\*Meyn, Charles A.  
Dean of Men  
Bucknell University  
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Minton, W. Stewart  
Assistant Dean of Men  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

Moyer, Alan Keith  
Coordinator of Housing  
Southern Illinois University  
Edwardsville, Illinois

Mulcahy, Andrew J.  
Western New England College  
Springfield, Massachusetts

Munger, David E.  
Assistant Dean of Men  
Albion College  
Albion, Michigan

Nahas, Russell  
Director of Orientation  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio

\*Nair, Donald A.  
Dean of Men  
Canisius College of Buffalo  
Buffalo, New York

\*Newman, James E.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

\*Nonnamaker, Eldon R.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Noordam, David  
Assistant to the Dean of Men  
University of Alabama  
University, Alabama

North, Gary  
Asst. to the Dean of Students  
Morehead State College  
Morehead, Kentucky

Norton, Donald  
Assistant Dean  
State Univ. of New York  
Albany, New York

Nowlis, Helen  
Dean of Students  
University of Rochester  
Rochester, New York

\*Ogdon, Allen E.  
Asst. in Student Personnel  
Eastern Washington State Coll.  
Cheney, Washington

Pawa, Irving  
19 Schmitt Road  
West Orange, New Jersey

Pease, N. Ronald  
Dean of Men  
Dickinson College  
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Pierce, Milo C.  
Apartment 12  
1525 Lincolnshire Drive  
Champaign, Illinois

\*Playe, George L.  
Dean of Undergraduate Students  
The University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

Putman, Ivan, Jr.  
Dean of Students  
State University of New York  
Fredonia, New York

Quigley, Donald  
Head Resident, Buell Hall  
Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Rathbun, Eula W.  
Rutgers  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Rea, Walter B.  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

\*Reddoch, James W.  
Dean of Student Services  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Renneisen, Charles M.  
Dean of Students  
Richmond Professional Institute  
Richmond, Virginia

Richmond, Arthur E.  
125 Roosevelt Boulevard  
Edison, New Jersey

\*Rodger, Allan W.  
Dean of Men  
Indiana State University  
Terre Haute, Indiana

\*Rohr, Urban E.  
Dean of Men  
Creighton University  
Omaha, Nebraska

Rubottom, Richard R.  
Vice President for Univ. Life  
Southern Methodist University  
Dallas, Texas

Ruch, Carl R.  
23 Bernard Road  
East Brunswick, New Jersey

Rudy, Joel Counselor for Student Activities Hunter College Bronx, New York	Smith, Edwin Dir. of Men's Residence Halls Illinois State University Normal, Illinois
Ruffner, Ralph Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois	Smith, L. N. Adviser on Foreign Student Aff. State Univ. of New York Buffalo, New York
Salowitz, Edward Head Resident Adviser Eastern Michigan Univ. Ypsilanti, Michigan	Stefl, James R. Dean of Men Iowa Wesleyan College Mount Pleasant, Iowa
Sandeen, C. Arthur Associate Director, Division of Residence Hall Programs Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan	Stevens, Richard F. Assistant Dean of Students Univ. of New Hampshire Durham, New Hampshire
Sartor, Laurence C. Coordinator of Student Activ. & Dir. of Men's Off-Campus Housing, State University College at Fredonia Fredonia, New York	Stewart, Michael O. Asst. to the Associate Dean of Students San Jose State College San Jose, California
Saurman, Kenneth P. Dean of Men DePaul University Chicago, Illinois	*Sunderland, Robert A., S. J. Dean of Men University of San Francisco San Francisco, California
Schmalfeld, Robert G. Asst. Dean of Men The University of Arizona Tucson, Arizona	*Sweet, Lufay Anderson, II Assistant Dean of Students Lake Forest College Lake Forest, Illinois
Scott, J. H. Assistant Dean of Men Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana	Tamte, James A. Assistant Dean of Men Northern Illinois University DeKalb, Illinois
*Shearer, Roderick C. Counselor Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan	*Taylor, Ralph L. Dean of Students Rutgers-The State Univ. Cranbury, Camden, New Jersey
Sidles, Craig W. Dean of Men Cornell College Mt. Vernon, Iowa	Thomas, James L. Director, Student Center Georgia Institute of Tech. Atlanta, Georgia
*Skornicka, Joel Asst. Dir., Student Activ. University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	Tichenor, A. H. Assistant Dean of Men Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana



Tipton, Betty R. Willimantic State College Willimantic, Connecticut	*Wilder, James C. Director of Men's Housing University of Alabama University, Alabama
Tombaugh, Richard 3005 Chinook Lane Lafayette, Indiana	Wright, William McKinely Associate Dean of Students DePauw University Greencastle, Indiana
Towner, Richard J. Assistant Dean of Men University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio	Yaros, Edward J. Associate Dean of Students Newark Coll. of Engineering Newark, New Jersey
Trayes, Marjorie M. 26 Redmond Street New Brunswick, New Jersey	Yocum, Janet E. Douglass College New Brunswick, New Jersey
Trumpe, Richard M. Coordinator of Student Activ. Illinois State University Normal, Illinois	*Yoder, John S. Head Resident, Johnson Hall University of Denver Denver, Colorado
Twitchell, Howard B. Golf Links Avenue, Rt. 44 New Brunswick, New Jersey	Yokie, J. Albin Director of Housing University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, Wisconsin
*Tyler, Robert Counselor to Men University of Alabama University, Alabama	Zaleski, Joe Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois
Wallace, W. Jewell Dean of Men Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas	Zillman, Theodore W. Asst. to Vice President University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin
Wells, Joseph P. Apt. 813, Bancroft 509 W. 121st Street New York, New York	
Wentzel, Philip R. Director of Housing C. W. Post College Greenvale, New York	
White, Mulvey, Vice Pres. Student & Alumni Affairs Univ. of Southern California Los Angeles, California	
Whittaker, Raymond C. Asst. Dean of Students Bowling Green State Univ. Bowling Green, Ohio	*Denotes attendance at 1966 Conference

## ASSOCIATES

\*Angell, Melvin A.  
Associate, Institutional  
Relations & Student Affairs  
The Calif. State Colleges  
Los Angeles, California

Anson, Jack L.  
National Secretary  
The Phi Kappa Tau Fraternity  
Oxford, Ohio

\*Armacost, Peter H.  
Program Director  
Association of American  
Colleges  
Washington, D. C.

Augustine, Roger D.  
Assistant to the Dean  
College of Engineering  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Bacon, Lewis  
National Executive Secretary  
Alpha Kappa Lambda Fraternity  
Fort Collins, Colorado

Balciulis, Charles A.  
Dean of Men  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois

Barnes, Douglas R.  
Dean of Students  
Andrew College  
Cuthbert, Georgia

Beck, Leland R.  
Dean of Students  
Eureka College  
Eureka, Illinois

Bringham, William T.  
Executive Secretary  
Sigma Chi Fraternity  
Evanston, Illinois

Brown, Dirck W.  
Associate Secretary  
National Education Assoc.  
Washington, D. C.

Bruce, Louis R.  
Executive Secretary  
Zeta Psi Fraternity  
New York, New York

Buchanan, Harold E.  
Executive Secretary  
Delta Chi Fraternity  
Iowa City, Iowa

Burns, Ralph F.  
Executive Secretary  
Alpha Sigma Phi Fraternity  
Delaware, Ohio

Butler, W. A., Jr.  
Delta Upsilon Fraternity, Inc.  
New York, New York

Callan, James P., Jr.  
Executive Secretary  
Phi Kappa Sigma  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Carberry, Basil, O.S.B.  
Dean of Students  
St. Anselm's College  
Manchester, New Hampshire

Chapman, George  
Theta Chi Fraternity  
Trenton, New Jersey

Clark, Roy C.  
Executive Secretary  
Acacia Fraternity  
Evanston, Illinois

Coe, Maynard H.  
Grand Secretary  
Alpha Gamma Rho Fraternity  
Des Plaines, Illinois

Connell, Charles A.  
Executive Secretary  
The Delta Phi Fraternity  
New York, New York

Croake, Richard M.  
Assistant Dean of Men  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois

\*Cross, K. Patricia  
Director, College and  
University Programs  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, New Jersey

\*Daniel, Ralph D.  
Executive Secretary  
Phi Kappa Psi  
Cleveland, Ohio

Duft, James H., Jr.  
Director of  
Residence Halls for Men  
Upsala College  
East Orange, New Jersey

\*Fletcher, Richard R.  
Executive Secretary  
Sigma Nu Fraternity  
Lexington, Virginia

Floyd, Eugene H.  
Western New England College  
Springfield, Massachusetts

Forester, William E.  
Executive Secretary  
Kappa Alpha Order  
Atlanta, Georgia

Freeman, Jane J.  
Director, Student Personnel  
Rockland Community College  
Suffern, New York

Fretz, Earl J.  
Secretary  
Psi Upsilon Fraternity  
New York, New York

Grace, Robert S., Rev.  
Dean of Men  
Mount Saint Mary's College  
Emmitsburg, Maryland

Gratwick, Roger W.  
Dean of Men  
State Univ. of New York  
Buffalo, New York

Greenstone, Albert  
Executive Secretary  
Phi Epsilon Pi  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Hardee, Melvane  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida

Helman, Ronald P.  
Administrative Secretary  
Beta Theta Pi  
Oxford, Ohio

\*Henderson, G. Gordon, S.J.  
Wheeling College  
Wheeling, West Virginia

Holland, James C.  
218 South Roosevelt  
Bloomington, Indiana

Hoskin, Richard D.  
Executive Officer  
Phi Sigma Epsilon Fraternity  
Indianapolis, Indiana

Howe, Raymond L.  
Theta Delta Chi Fraternity  
New York, New York

Hoyt, Donald P.  
Coordinator of Research Serv.  
American Coll. Testing Program  
Iowa City, Iowa

Jaklanen, Arthur W.  
Dean of Student Personnel  
Oakland Community College  
Union Lake, Michigan

Janca, W. Joe  
Executive Director  
Phi Kappa Theta Fraternity  
Worcester, Massachusetts

Johnson, Alan W.  
Foreign Student Adviser  
Univ. of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California

Johnson, Donald M.  
Executive Director  
Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity  
Richmond, Virginia

Killoren, Kenneth E., S. J.  
Dean of Student Affairs  
Sogang, Seoul, Korea

Lacasse, Brother James L. Dir. of Student Affairs Walsh College Canton, Ohio	Miller, James Resident Counselor Welch Residence Hall Ohio Wesleyan University Delaware, Ohio
LeClere, William E. Executive Secretary Chi Psi Fraternity Ann Arbor, Michigan	Miller, Joe W. Assoc. Dean of Students Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois
Leonard, Donald G. Dean of Students Niagara County Community Coll. Niagara Falls, New York	Miller, Robert Executive Secretary Phi Delta Theta Oxford, Ohio
Lewin, Alex Phi Sigma Delta Fraternity New York, New York	Mitchell, Nan Director of Student Activities Mercy College of Detroit Detroit, Michigan
Lindblade, Charles F. Registrar The Loop Junior College Chicago, Illinois	*Mohline, Richard J. Dean of Students Moody Bible Institute Chicago, Illinois
Madgwick, Gordon A. Dean of Students Southern Missionary College Collegedale, Tennessee	Nelson, Mildred I. Director of Residence Halls for Women Upsala College East Orange, New Jersey
Malin, Charles, S.V.D. Academic Dean Divine Word College Seminary Epworth, Iowa	O'Sullivan, Kevin Assistant Dean of Students- Activities Southampton College Southampton, L.I., New York
Markley, Larry Director, Men's Residence Hall Programs State College of Iowa Cedar Falls, Iowa	Owen, Durward Executive Secretary The Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity Charlotte, North Carolina
Martin, Henry G. Dean of Students Eastern Kentucky State Coll. Richmond, Kentucky	Pearcy, Evert R. Director of Student Affairs Salem College Salem, West Virginia
Melchert, Bruce B. Executive Secretary Tau Kappa Epsilon Indianapolis, Indiana	Pedersen, James O. Director Admissions and Records South Dakota State University Brookings, South Dakota
*Miller, Carroll L. Acting Dean, Graduate School Howard University Washington, D. C.	

Phelps, Fred D.  
Asst. to the Dean of Men  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois

\*Pontieri, Sister Miriam  
Carmel, SNJM  
Dean of Students  
Fort Wright College  
Spokane, Washington

Price, Ernest, Jr.  
Associate Secretary, Nat'l.  
Student Council of YMCA's  
New York, New York

Riegel, Paul S.  
Dean of Students  
Bloomsburg State College  
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

Rishel, Darrell F.  
Director, Office of  
Intermediate Registration  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland

Rogers, Clifford L.  
Associate Director  
Thomas Hall  
Eastern Illinois University  
Charleston, Illinois

Ryan, John, O.S.F.S.  
Dean of Men  
Allentown College of  
St. Francis de Sales  
Center Valley, Pennsylvania

\*Scanlon, Joseph  
Alpha Phi Omega  
Kansas City, Missouri

Schwartz, William P.  
Executive Secretary  
Sigma Alpha Mu  
New York, New York

Scobie, Herbert F.  
Executive Director  
Triangle Fraternity  
Evanston, Illinois

Shainline, John W.  
Dean of Students  
Cumberland County College  
Vineland, New Jersey

\*Shannon, Albert C., O.S.A.  
Executive Director  
Augustinian Educational Ass'n.  
Villanova, Pennsylvania

Sheriff, Alfred P., III  
Executive Vice President  
Delta Tau Delta Fraternity  
Indianapolis, Indiana

Siegel, Barry  
Executive Secretary  
Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity  
New York, New York

\*Smith, Rex A.  
Eminent Supreme Recorder  
Sigma Alpha Epsilon  
Evanston, Illinois

\*Sours, James K.  
Executive Vice President  
American Coll. Testing Program  
Iowa City, Iowa

Steyer, Caryl  
Dean of Men  
Midland Lutheran College  
Fremont, Nebraska

Suntag, Sidney S.  
Executive Secretary  
Tau Epsilon Phi Fraternity  
New York, New York

\*Taylor, James W.  
Director, Bromley Hall  
Champaign, Illinois

Terry, B. Andrew, Brother  
Dean of Students  
St. Michael's College  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Toll, George S.  
Executive Secretary  
Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity  
St. Louis, Missouri

Toscano, Elizabeth M.  
Holyoke Community College  
Holyoke, Massachusetts

\*Uihlein, George V., Jr.  
Secretary  
Phi Kappa Theta Fraternity  
Worcester, Massachusetts

Van Dusen, William D.  
Coll. Entrance Examination Bd.  
New York, New York

Wacker, Francis  
Executive Secretary  
Delta Sigma Phi Fraternity  
Denver, Colorado

Walter, Otis L.  
Dean of Men  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois

Watchorn, W. Henson  
National Secretary  
Alpha Chi Rho  
One Maiden Lane  
New York, New York

Watkins, Earl  
Executive Director  
The Pi Kappa Alpha Fraternity  
Memphis, Tennessee

Whitesitt, E. Kennedy  
Executive Secretary  
Sigma Tau Gamma Fraternity  
St. Louis, Missouri

Wittich, John J.  
Executive Director  
College Student Personnel  
Institute  
Claremont, California

\*Wolf, Dan B., Director  
Student Personnel Services  
Indiana University  
Indianapolis, Indiana

Zerman, William S.  
Executive Secretary  
Phi Gamma Delta  
Washington, D. C.

#### STUDENT AFFILIATES

Aaron, Ron  
Assistant Director  
Parsons Hall  
Indiana State University  
Terre Haute, Indiana

Allen, Neal  
Residence Hall Director  
Bowling Green State Univ.  
Bowling Green, Ohio

Andringa, Robert  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Bacheller, John  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Bailey, Dallas  
Office of the Dean of Men  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio

Baranski, Jerome M.  
Graduate Resident Adviser  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Mich.

Bartlett, David  
Office of the Dean of Men  
Bucknell University  
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Batista, Donald M.  
32 East Broad Street  
Mount Vernon, New York

Black, Martin  
2250 E. Missouri Street  
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Chesin, Sorrell  
State Univ. of New York  
Albany, New York

\*Christie, Tasso G.  
Box 2329, Station A  
Champaign, Illinois

Dotson, Ben R.  
Director  
Waterfield Hall  
Morehead State College  
Morehead, Kentucky

Englund, Thomas  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Forrest, James F.  
Grinnell College  
Grinnell, Iowa

Gohn, Lyle Alan  
Office of Admissions  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana

Gottshall, Ronald  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Hallenbeck, Daniel A.  
State College of Iowa  
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Heddlestone, L. L.  
Pennsylvania State Univ.  
University Park, Pa.

Hefke, Norman  
1030 North Fairview  
Lansing, Michigan

Jenks, Frederick L., Jr.  
4212 Fruitland Drive  
Parma, Ohio

Johnson, Thomas B.  
2245 Sheridan Road  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois

Jonas, Stephen  
B532 Briscoe Quadrangle  
Bloomington, Indiana

Kaplan, Jack  
800 Tuckahoe Road, Apt. 36  
Yonkers, New York

Kawesch, Philip  
1711 Lakewood Avenue  
Durham, North Carolina

McClellan, Stephen  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Manges, R. J.  
Office of Admissions, Purdue U.  
Lafayette, Indiana

O'Donnell, S. Bruce  
School of Educ.. U. of Denver  
Denver, Colorado

Orr, James D.  
Rutgers  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Pappas, John, Resident Couns.  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio

Pekarek, Robert C.  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana

Peters, David  
508B Allenhurst Road  
Amherst, New York

Rusco, James A.  
Fort Hays Kansas State College  
Hays, Kansas

Salisch, Marc S.  
119 W. Jericho Tpk.  
Syosset, New York

Smith, Duncan R.  
345 Farley Avenue  
Scotch Plains, New Jersey

Smith, Patrick  
412 M.A.C. Avenue  
East Lansing, Michigan

Swanda, John R., Jr.  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, Illinois

Swanson, Jerry, Head Resident  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, Illinois

Upcraft, M. Lee  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Wall, Robert  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland

\*Denotes attendance at 1966 Conference

APPENDIX C

1966 Conference

Seattle, Washington

ATTENDANCE

FORTY-EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

Individuals marked on Roster of Members (Appendix C) with an asterisk (\*), plus the following:

Adams, Donald W.  
Assistant Dean of Men  
Univ. of Louisville  
Louisville, Kentucky

Adams, Paul R.  
Dir. of Stu. Affairs &  
Dean of Men  
Univ. of Calgary  
Calgary, Alberta, Can.

Anders, Maurice C.  
Dean of Men  
Amarillo College  
Amarillo, Texas

Anderson, Dr. Carl L.  
Chief Alcoholism &  
Drug Abuse, N.I.M.H.  
Washington, D. C.

Arrowsmith, Bobby G.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
Ripon College  
Ripon, Wisconsin

Balch, Richard  
Exec. Administrator  
Mental Research Institute  
Palo Alto, California

Beal, Philip E.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Univ. of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Bell, Roger J.  
Univ. of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Bennion, Lowell L.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah

Bogen, Dr. Gerald K.  
Assoc. Dir. Admissions  
Univ. of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Boland, Rev. John A., S.J.  
Dir. of Stu. Personnel Serv.  
St. Peter's College  
Jersey City, New Jersey

Bowlin, Robert L.  
Dean of Men  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Brammer, Lawrence M., Prof.  
Univ. of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Brandenburgh, Kenneth E.  
Dir. of Men's Residence Halls  
Univ. of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky

Brown, Russell H.  
Admin. Asst. to the Vice Chan-  
cellor for Student Affairs  
University of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska

Bruer, Bill  
Dean of Students  
Columbia Basin College  
Pasco, Washington

Bruyn, Henry B., Director  
Student Health Service  
Univ. of California  
Berkeley, California

Bundgaard, Leslie R.  
Exec. Dean for Student Life  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland

Burdick, John A.  
Dean of Student Affairs  
Grossmont College  
El Cajon, California

Bushnell, Shirley W.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California



Bustamante, Bro. Adrian B.  
Dean of Students  
College of Santa Fe  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Caballero, B.  
Director of Admissions  
Upper Iowa College  
Fayette, Iowa

Cadd, Sr., Jeanne Rose  
Dean of Women  
Marylhurst College  
Marylhurst, Oregon

Caldwell, Rev. Joseph  
Chaplain  
Loyola University  
Los Angeles, California

Carey, John J.  
Dean of Students  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida

Carruth, Thomas Paige  
Dean of Student Life  
West Texas State University  
Canyon, Texas

Carsten, Con  
Dir. of Student Affairs  
Centralia College  
Centralia, Wash.

Caskey, Jesse M.  
Dean of Students  
Highline College  
Midway, Washington

Churchill, J. L.  
Dean of Students  
Oregon Tech.  
Klamath Falls, Oregon

Clark, Selby G.  
Dir. Counseling Center  
Portland State College  
Portland, Oregon

Cohen, Matthew A.  
Assoc. Coordinator of  
Educ. Activities  
Portland State College  
Portland, Oregon

Collier, Kenneth M.  
Dean of Men-Asst. Dean of  
Students  
Ball State University  
Muncie, Indiana

Cooper, Theodore S., Pres.  
Assoc. of College Admissions  
Counselors  
Denver, Colorado

Corkery, Jack  
Dean of Students  
Cochise College  
Douglas, Arizona

Corson, Louis D., Warden  
College of Church Musicians  
Washington Cathedral  
Washington, D.C.

Costello, Rev. Frank  
Exec. Vice President  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

Covert, E. Richard, Asst.  
Prof. of Student Personnel  
Queens College of The City  
University of New York  
Flushing, New York

Cowley, W. H.  
Prof. of Higher Education  
Leland Stanford University  
Palo Alto, California

Daly, Rev. Bro. John E.  
Dean of Men  
Iona College  
New Rochelle, New York

Dannegger, Marilyn E.  
Dean of Women  
Nat'l. College of Education  
Evanston, Illinois

Davis, Douglas D.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Dickeson, Robert C.  
Dir. of Student Activities  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, Missouri

Dickinson, Carl M.  
Assoc. Director  
Placement Services  
Univ. of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Dimas, George C.  
Exec. Dir. Alcohol Studies  
& Rehabilitation Center  
State of Oregon  
Mental Health Division  
Portland, Oregon

Dollar, Robert J.  
Dean of Student Life  
Arlington State College  
Univ. of Texas System  
Arlington, Texas

Donoghue, M. Joseph  
Dean of Men  
Univ. of Detroit  
Detroit, Michigan

Donohue, Lawrence Rev., S.J.  
Dean of Men  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

Dugan, Willis E.  
Executive Director  
American Personnel and  
Guidance Assoc.  
Washington, D. C.

Ebel, Sterling  
District Director -  
Pacific Northwest  
The American College Testing  
Program  
Iowa City, Iowa

Eesa, Sister M. Mel, C.S.J.  
Dean of Women  
St. Mary of the Plains College  
Dodge City, Kansas

Ewing, James W.  
Assoc. Director of the Office  
of Student Activities  
Washington University  
St. Louis, Missouri

Fisher, Charles G.  
Acting Dean of Men  
Univ. of California  
Davis, California

Fitterer, John Rev., S.J.  
President  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

Flint, James C.  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Folsom, Willys W.  
Test Officer  
Sacramento State College  
Sacramento, California

Ford, Jeremiah  
Director of Athletics  
Univ. of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Franks, Lawrence T.  
Dean of Men  
University of Texas  
Austin, Texas

Fry, G. Stanley  
Dean of Students  
The School of the Ozarks  
Point Lookout, Missouri

Gaffney, Louis  
Dean of Graduate School  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

Gaines, Dr. Edwin M.  
Exec. Asst. to the President  
for Student Affairs  
University of Wyoming  
Laramie, Wyoming

Galbraith, M. J.  
Dean of Student Affairs  
University of Illinois  
Medical Center  
Chicago, Illinois

Giddins, Dr. Paul H., President  
Hamline University  
St. Paul, Minnesota

Giles, Dr. Frederick T.  
Prof. of Higher Education  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Glenn, Carroll J.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
Director of Housing  
Rockhurst College  
Kansas City, Missouri

Goodridge, Dr. Robert C.  
Field Representative  
U.S. Office of Education  
San Francisco, California

Greeley, Andrew Rev.  
Senior Study Director  
Nat'l Opinion Research Corp.  
Chicago, Illinois

Gregg, Mrs. Lois H.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
State Univ. of New York  
Albany, New York

Greif, Tom  
Dean of Students  
Gonzaga University  
Spokane, Washington

Griffin, Robert K.  
Dir. of Student Personnel  
Fairfield University  
Fairfield, Connecticut

Haley, Tenison, Director  
Counseling and Texting  
Central Oregon College  
Bend, Oregon

Hall, Jack B.  
Acting Dean of Men  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, Kentucky

Hamilton, Tom  
Exec. Director, AAWU  
San Francisco, California

Hamm, George F.  
Dean of Students  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, Arizona

Hampton, V.J.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

Hanrahan, Rev. Edward J., S.J.  
Dir. of Resident Students  
Boston College  
Newton, Mass.

Hansmeier, Thomas W.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Southern Illinois Univ.  
Edwardsville, Illinois

Hanson, John E.  
Assistant Dean of Students  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Hartenbach, Rev. David L., S.J.  
Graduate Student  
St. Louis University  
St. Louis, Missouri

Hayes, Phil H.  
Residence Hall Director  
Indiana State College  
Terre Haute, Indiana

Higman, Dr. Howard  
Professor of Sociology  
University of Colorado  
Denver, Colorado

Hilliard, Robert J.  
Staff of Dean of Men  
Washington State University  
Pullman, Washington

Hodgson, Thomas  
Associate Dean of Students  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Horita, Dr. Akira, Professor  
Dept. of Pharmacology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Houlihan, Rev. Robert F., S.J.  
Dean of Students  
Regis College  
Denver, Colorado

Howard, John, President  
Lewis and Clark College  
Portland, Oregon

Isen, Leo  
Conference Reporter  
Chicago, Illinois

Jackson, Ronald  
Dean of Students  
University of Rochester  
Rochester, New York

Jacobovitz, Rabbi Arthur  
Hillel Foundation  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Jacobsen, Owen D.  
Industry Marketing Representative,  
IBM Western Divn.  
Los Angeles, California

Jalkanen, Arthur  
Dean of Student Personnel  
Oakland Community College  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Jenkins, Tom  
Assistant Dean of Men  
The University of Texas  
Austin, Texas

Johnson, Dixon C.  
Assistant Dean of Students  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Johnson, Leighland E.  
Assistant Dean of Students  
Pacific Lutheran University  
Tacoma, Washington

Kluge, Donald A.  
Dean of Men and  
Assistant of Students  
Eastern Illinois University  
Charleston, Illinois

Krbec, Kirby A.  
Dir. of Union & Activities  
Central Washington State Col.  
Ellensburg, Washington

Krovitz, Robert W., President  
National Interfraternity Conf.  
Wollaston, Mass.

Large, Larry D.  
Admissions Counselor  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Larkins, Richard  
Athletic Director  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio

Lawrence, Robert S.  
Asst. Vice Chancellor  
Student Affairs  
University of California  
Irvine, California

Leggett, Dr. Glenn, President  
Grinnell College  
Grinnell, Iowa

Lillie, F. D.  
Dean of Students  
Metropolitan State College  
Denver, Colorado

Lloyd-Jones, Esther  
430 W. 116th Street  
New York, New York

Long, William G.  
Dean of Men  
Univ. of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Lunsford, Dr. Terry  
Research Associate  
University of California  
Berkeley, California

MacMitchell, T. Leslie  
Exec. Assoc. to the President  
College Entrance Examination  
Board, New York, New York

Madden, Martha, Director  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Mark, Frank H.  
Exec. Director, YMCA  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Martin, Ronald "Keith"  
1828 E. 40th Avenue  
Spokane, Washington

Marts, Marion E.  
Vice Provost & Professor  
of Geography  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Mathers, Dr. Harold  
Regional Director - West Coast  
The American College Testing  
Program  
Iowa City, Iowa

Matson, Jane E.  
Professor of Education  
Los Angeles State College  
Los Angeles, California

Maureen, Sister, C.S.J.  
Instructor  
St. Mary of the Plains Coll.  
Dodge City, Kansas

Mayer, Dennis M.  
Dir. of Student Personnel  
Mt. San Antonio College  
Walnut, California

McAuley, Raymond Rev., S.J.  
Executive Vice President  
Marquette University  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

McCormick, James P.  
Vice Pres. for Stu. Affairs  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, Michigan

McHugh, Margaret, Counselor  
Idaho State University  
Pocatello, Idaho

McNulty, Edmund B., Rev.  
Vice President Finance  
Seattle University  
Seattle Washington

Meardy, William H.  
Dean of Student Personnel  
Rio Hondo Junior College  
Whittier, California

Meddish, Donna M.  
Dean of Women  
Pacific University  
Forest Grove, Oregon

Meddish, Richard R.  
Assoc. Coordinator Educa-  
tional Activities  
Portland State College  
Portland, Oregon

Moore, James, Director  
College Work-Study Program  
Division of Financial Aids  
USOE, Washington, D. C.

Morrison, Dr. Jack R.  
Dean of Students  
Lock Haven State College  
Lock Haven, Pennsylvania

Morton, Rev. Edmund W., S.J.  
Academic Vice President  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

Nelson, J. Manning  
Dean of Students  
Clark College  
Vancouver, Washington

Nesvig, Milton L.  
Vice President -  
University Relations  
Pacific Lutheran University  
Tacoma, Washington

Newman, Dewey L.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
University of Idaho  
Moscow, Idaho

Norman, Earl T.  
Dean of Students  
Green River Community College  
Auburn, Washington

Nowak, Daniel B.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Nudd, T. Rober  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California

Nunn, Michael K.  
Graduate Assistant  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon

Offenberg, Richard S.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Springfield College  
Springfield, Mass.

Ohl, Ronald E.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Elmhurst College  
Elmhurst, Illinois

Ortenzi, Angelo  
Dir. of Student Activities  
Stout State University  
Menomonie, Wisconsin

Pahre, Richard E.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon

Parkhurst, Nelson M.  
Registrar  
Purdue University  
Lafayette, Indiana

Parr, Preston  
Dean of Student Life  
Lehigh University  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Pesqueira, Richard E.  
Sr. Residence Adviser  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California

Peterson, Marvin W.  
Assistant Dean  
Harvard Business School  
Boston, Mass.

Phillips, Richard M.  
Dean of Students  
Gallaudet College  
Washington, D. C.

Poppen, Donald E.  
Dean of Men, Director of  
Guidance Services  
Morningside College  
Sioux City, Iowa

Porter, Robert D.  
Dean of Students  
Alaska Methodist Univ.  
Anchorage, Alaska

Pringle, J. Arthur  
Dir. of Student Residences  
& Campus Food Services  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Quann, Charles Jim  
Dean of Men, Central  
Washington State College  
Ellensburg, Washington

Quigley, E. James  
Dean of Men  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado

Raines, Dr. Max, Professor of  
Higher Education  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Ramey, Howard L.  
Dir. of Financial Aids  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Ramey, Marjory A.  
Dir. of Educational Pro-  
gramming, Housing Department  
University of Oregon  
Eugene Oregon

Reilly, Agnes E.  
Dean of Women  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

Reynolds, Richard C., Director  
of Viking Union & Student Activ.  
Western Washington State College  
Bellingham, Washington

Roberts, Janes D.  
Assoc. Dean of Men  
Walla Walla College  
College Place, Washington

Robinson, Donald, Prof. of  
Higher Education, Coordinator,  
Grad. Studies in Student Pers.  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, Illinois

Robinson, Eugene E.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

Rogers, Clifford L.  
Dean of Students  
St. Ambrose College  
Davenport, Iowa

Romine, Ray S.  
Asst. Director of  
Student Activities-  
Residence Halls  
Western Wash. State Coll.  
Bellingham, Washington

Romm, Richard Bruce  
Counselor Supervisor-  
Dept. of Housing  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Root, Reginald D.  
Dean of Men  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Roth, Franklin G., Jr.  
Dean of Students  
Sheldon Jackson Junior Coll.  
Sitka, Alaska

Rummel, J. Francis  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
for Graduate Students  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Ryan, James, O.S.A.  
Dean of Student Activities  
Villanova University  
Villanova, Pennsylvania

Saurman, Kenneth P.  
Dean of Men  
DePaul University  
Chicago, Illinois

Scott, D. Dean  
Dean of Men  
North Dakota State Univ.  
Fargo, North Dakota

Seeborg, Arnold W.  
Dean of Students  
Blue Mountain College  
Pendleton, Oregon

Shelden, Miriam A.  
Dean of Women  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, Illinois

Sherburne, Philip G.  
President, USNSA  
Washington, D. C.

Sherburne, Richard Rev., S.J.  
Dean of Students  
Marquette University  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Simmons, H. Edward  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Lewis and Clark College  
Portland, Oregon

Smith, Frank M.  
Dir. of Student Activities  
Monmouth College,  
West Long Branch, New Jersey

Smith, Herbert E.  
Assoc. Director Student Activ.  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana

Smith, Joel P.  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Spilka, Bernard  
Professor of Psychology  
University of Denver  
Denver, Colorado

Spolyar, Ludwig  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Stamatakis, Louis C.  
Dean of Student Services  
Grand Valley State College  
Allendale, Michigan

Stankiewicz, Rev. John A.  
Dean of Men  
St. Michael's College  
Winooski, Vermont

Stefl, James R.  
Dean of Men  
Iowa Wesleyan College  
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa

Steig, Dr. Lester R.  
Past President  
Alpha Phi Omega  
Salary Coordinator  
San Francisco School System  
San Francisco, California

Steinberg, Vicki Linda  
Coord. of Student Activ.  
Highline College  
Seattle, Washington

Stevens, George F.  
President Assn. of College  
Unions-International  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon

Stockton, Larry O.  
Dean of Men  
New Mexico State Univ.  
University Park, New Mexico

Strawn, Mrs. Dorothy R.  
Dean of Women &  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Swenson, Theodore H.  
Asst. Dean of Students  
Univ. of California  
San Francisco, California

Thomas, Alfred, Jr.  
Registrar & Direc. of Admis.  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, Arizona

Tripp, Phillip A.  
Research Specialist  
U.S. Office of Education  
Washington, D. C.

Tyler, Leona,  
Dean of the Graduate School  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon

Uihlein, George V., Jr.  
Asst. Dean of Men  
Loyola College of Montreal  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Van Cleve, William A.  
Director of Student Affairs  
St. John's University  
Collegeville, Minnesota

Vice, James W.  
Asst. Dean of Students;  
Dir. of Student Housing  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Illinois

Von Kaenel, George E.  
Dir. of Spiritual Activities  
Loyola University  
Chicago, Illinois

Wagenschein, Miriam  
Dean of Women  
Whitman College  
Walla Walla, Washington

Waldo, Robert, Vice President  
University Relations  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington

Watts, Dr. William A.  
Research Associate  
University of California  
Berkeley, California

White, Richard S.  
Dean of Students  
Shoreline Community College  
Seattle, Washington

William, D. Williams  
Assoc. Dean of Students  
Portland State College  
Portland, Oregon

Wittich, John J.  
Executive Director, College  
Student Personnel Institute  
Claremont, California

Woodring, Dr. Paul  
Distinguished Service  
Prof. of the College  
Western Washington University  
Bellingham, Washington

Yanitelli, S.J., President  
St. Peter's College  
Jersey City, New Jersey

Young, David A., Director  
of Counseling Center  
N.Dakota State University  
Fargo, North Dakota

Yourick, George A., Jr.  
Dean of Men  
University of Arkansas  
Fayetteville, Arkansas



## APPENDIX D

### COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

(Made up of all living Past Presidents in attendance, plus six members elected by the Association. The senior Past President present serves as the Chairman.)

#### Living Past Presidents of the Association

Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin, 1919 (1),  
1928 (10)  
Dean W. E. Alderman, Miami University, 1936 (18)  
President D. S. Lancaster, Longwood College, 1937 (19)  
Vice President D. H. Gardner, University of Akron, 1938 (20),  
1939 (21)  
Vice President J. J. Thompson, St. Olaf College, 1951 (23)  
Vice President J. H. Julian, University of South Dakota,  
1944 (26)  
Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas, 1947 (29)  
Dean E. C. Cloyd, North Carolina State College, 1948 (30)  
Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama, 1949 (31)  
Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College, 1950 (32)  
Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, 1951 (33)  
President A. Blair Knapp, Denison University, 1952 (34)  
President Victor F. Spathelf, Ferris State, 1953 (35)  
Dean John H. Stibbs, Tulane University, 1955 (37)  
Dean John E. Hocutt, University of Delaware, 1956 (38)  
Secretary Frank C. Baldwin, Cornell University, 1957 (39)  
Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon, 1958 (40)  
Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois, 1959 (41)  
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University, 1960 (42)  
William S. Guthrie, Formerly Ohio State University, 1961 (43)  
Vice President Fred J. Weaver, University of North Carolina,  
1962 (44)  
Dean J. C. Clevenger, Washington State University, 1963 (45)  
Dean James C. McLeod, Northwestern University, 1964 (46)  
President Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., St. Peter's College,  
1965 (47)

#### Elected Members

Robert Shaffer, Dean of Students, Indiana University  
Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men, University of Illinois  
Robert Etheridge, Executive Dean for Student Affairs, Miami  
University of Ohio  
Earle Clifford, Dean of Student Affairs, Rutgers University  
John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College  
Mark W. Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University

# APPENDIX E

## SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meeting	Year	President	Place	President	Secretary
1	1919	6	Madison, Wisconsin	S.H. Goodnight	L.A. Strauss
2	1920	9	Urbana, Illinois	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
3	1921	16	Iowa City, Iowa	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
4	1922	20	Lexington, Ky.	E.E. Nicholson	S.H. Goodnight
5	1923	17	Lafayette, Ind.	Stanley Coulter	E.E. Nicholson
6	1924	29	Ann Arbor, Mich.	J.A. Bursley	E.E. Nicholson
7	1925	31	Chapel Hill, N.C.	Robert Rienow	F.F. Bradshaw
8	1926	46	Minneapolis, Minn.	C.R. Melcher	F.F. Bradshaw
9	1927	43	Atlanta, Georgia	Floyd Field	F.F. Bradshaw
10	1928	50	Boulder, Colorado	S.H. Goodnight	F.M. Dawson
11	1929	75	Washington, D.C.	C.B. Culver	V.I. Moore
12	1930	64	Fayetteville, Ark.	J.W. Armstrong	V.I. Moore
13	1931	83	Knoxville, Tenn.	W.J. Sanders	V.I. Moore
14	1932	40	Los Angeles, Cal.	V.I. Moore	D.H. Gardner
15	1933	55	Columbus, Ohio	C.E. Edmondson	D.H. Gardner
16	1934	61	Evanston, Ill.	H.E. Lobdell	D.H. Gardner
17	1935	56	Baton Rouge, La.	B.A. Tolbert	D.H. Gardner
18	1936	92	Philadelphia, Pa.	W.E. Alderman	D.H. Gardner
19	1937	80	Austin, Texas	D.S. Lancaster	D.H. Gardner
20	1938	164	Madison, Wisconsin	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
21	1939	87	Roanoke, Virginia	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
22	1940	58	Albuquerque, N.Mex.	F.J. Findlay	F.H. Turner
23	1941	100	Cincinnati, Ohio	J.J. Thompson	F.H. Turner
24	1942	114	Urbana, Illinois	L.S. Corbett	F.H. Turner
25	1943	101	Columbus, Ohio	J.A. Park	F.H. Turner
26	1944	96	Chicago, Illinois	J.H. Julian	F.H. Turner
27	1945	Due to Office of Defense Transportation-No Meeting held			
28	1946	142	Lafayette, Indiana	Earl J. Miller	F.H. Turner
29	1947	170	Ann Arbor, Mich.	Arno Nowotny	F.H. Turner
30	1948	173	Dallas, Texas	E.L. Cloyd	F.H. Turner
31	1949	217	Highland Park, Ill.	J.H. Newman	F.H. Turner
32	1950	210	Williamsburg, Va.	L.K. Neidlinger	F.H. Turner
33	1951	222	St. Louis, Mo.	W.P. Lloyd	F.H. Turner
34	1952	180	Colo. Springs, Colo.	A. Blair Knapp	F.H. Turner
35	1953	245	East Lansing, Mich.	V.F. Spathelf	F.H. Turner
36	1954	231	Roanoke, Virginia	R.M. Strozier	F.H. Turner
37	1955	230	Lafayette, Ind.	J.H. Tibbs	F.H. Turner
38	1956	201	Berkeley, Cal.	J.E. Hocutt	F.H. Turner
39	1957	231	Durham, N. Carolina	F.C. Baldwin	F.H. Turner
40	1958	306	French Lick, Ind.	D.M. DuShane	F.H. Turner
41	1959	303	Boston, Mass.	F.H. Turner	C.W. Knox
42	1960	367	Columbus, Ohio	H.D. Winbigler	C.W. Knox
43	1961	303	Colo. Springs, Colo.	W.S. Guthrie	C.W. Knox
44	1962	408	Philadelphia, Pa.	F.H. Weaver	C.W. Knox
45	1963	383	Evanston, Ill.	J.C. Clevenger	C.W. Knox
46	1964	510	Detroit, Mich.	J.C. McLeod	C.W. Knox
47	1965	864	Washington, D.C.	V.R. Yanitelli	C.W. Knox
48	1966	423	Seattle, Wash.	G.T. Nygreen	C.W. Knox